



DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 130

6 July 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

U.S., NATO Motives Said To Thwart Nuclear Freeze [IZVESTIYA 1 Jul]	AA 1
Washington Arms Race Advocates Ridiculed [PRAVDA 2 Jul]	AA 3
Neutron Weapon Production, Deployment Blasted	AA 4
Disarmament Committee Discusses Moscow Statement	AA 5
UN Meeting on Peaceful Outer Space Ends	AA 5
'Star War' Plans Deplored	AA 6

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Bogomolov Reviews CEMA Integration Process [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Jun]	BB 1
Communique Issued on CEMA Executive Session [PRAVDA 2 Jul]	BB 3

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

PRAVDA on Moscow Summit, ASEAN, UNCTAD Meetings [3 Jul]	CC 1
Belgrade UNCTAD Conference Completes Work	CC 4
U.S. Delegate's Speech Hit [Ablamov]	CC 5
Kovalev, Spanish Foreign Minister Moran Meet	CC 6
Kovalev Addresses Madrid CSCE Meeting	CC 6
'Hope' Apparent for Successful End to CSCE Session	CC 7
Contrast Between Warsaw Pact, NATO Viewed	CC 8

UNITED STATES & CANADA

U.S. Congressional Delegation Visits, Views Ties [IZVESTIYA 5 Jul]	A 1
Leaves Leningrad for Moscow	A 1
Visits USSR Supreme Soviet	A 1
Ruben Addresses Delegation	A 2
Reagan's 'Rearmament' Strategy Attacked	A 6
Supreme Soviet Cables 4 Jul Greetings to Reagan [PRAVDA 3 Jul]	A 7

CHINA

PRC Friendship Group Delegations Visit Moscow	B 1
3 Jul Arrival	B 1
4 Jul Activities	B 1
5 Jul Speeches	B 1

SOUTH ASIA

India's Rajiv Gandhi on 10-Day Visit to USSR	D 1
Met by Shitikov	D 1
Talks With Shitikov	D 1
Interviewed in Delhi [IZVESTIYA 5 Jul]	D 1
USSR-DRA Economic Commission Agreements Cited	D 2

WESTERN EUROPE

Kohl, Genscher at Moscow Dinner; Talks Continue	G 1
Tikhonov Dinner Speech [PRAVDA 6 Jul]	G 1
Kohl Dinner Speech [PRAVDA 6 Jul]	G 3
First Andropov-Kohl Talks	G 8
DPA on Talks, Itinerary	G 9
Second Andropov-Kohl Talks	G 10
Talks 'Satisfactory' Despite Differences [DPA]	G 11
Third Tikhonov Meeting Held	G 12
Ustinov Receives Kohl, Genscher	G 12
Kohl Assessment of Talks [DPA]	G 13
Kohl Press Conference	G 13
Meetings 'Satisfactory', 'Open' [DPA]	G 14
USSR-FRG Relations Analyzed [Kornilov]	G 15
Arms Stance Criticized [Levin]	G 16
Bush Continues W. Europe Tour to Denmark, Iceland	G 17
Meets Danish Premier	G 17
Bush Statements Attacked [Goncharev]	G 18
Arrives in Iceland	G 19
Zimyanin Delegation Departs Paris for Moscow	G 19
[PRAVDA 4 Jul]	

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

PRAVDA's Demchenko on Shultz Near East Visit [5 Jul]	H 1
PLO Executive Committee Meets; Issues Statement	H 1
PLO Groups Meet in Damascus, Urge Unity	H 2
Arab Leaders To Meet; Seek To Heal PLO Rift	H 2
[Belyayev in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 6 Jul]	
Al-Kasm Rejects Attempts To Pressure Syria	H 3
IZVESTIYA Discusses Arab, PLO Unity, Near East [1 Jul]	H 4
USSR-Iraqi Economic Protocol Promotes Cooperation	H 5
[PRAVDA 2 Jul]	
Efforts of Maghreb Countries Toward Unity Cited	H 6
[Bilyakov]	
U.S. 'Provocation' in Libyan Airspace Cited	H 6

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Prominent Cuban Communist Party Official Dies	K 1
CPSU Condolence Message [PRAVDA 4 Jul]	K 1
Gorbachev Offers Condolences	K 1
Colombian Parliamentarians Continue Visit	K 1
Meet Kuznetsov [IZVESTIYA 3 Jul]	K 1
Conclude Visit [IZVESTIYA 5 Jul]	K 2
Honduran 'Provocation' Could Unleash War	K 2
SELSKAYA ZHIZN on Guatemala Solidarity Day	K 1
[Kolesnikov, 26 Jun]	
Briefs: RSFSR Delegation Visits Venezuela	K 3

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Latest Satellite Launches, Experiments Reported	U 1
Cosmonauts Unload Cosmos-1443	U 1
Cosmos-1472 Launched	U 1
Eight Satellites Launched	U 1
'Gorizont' Satellite	U 1

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Ustinov Notes Tasks of Baltic Exercises	V 1
---	-----

U.S., NATO MOTIVES SAID TO THWART NUCLEAR FREEZE

PM011555 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by S. Shavlov: "Necessary Measure; a Nuclear Arms Freeze Accords with the Peoples' Aspirations"]

[Text] The key issue of our time -- and this is reemphasized in the joint statement of those taking part in the Moscow meeting of leading party and state figures of the socialist community countries -- is the speediest halting of the arms race and the transition to disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament.

At the Moscow meeting our country and its allies again came out with a broad and specific program of measures capable of pushing back the threat of war, channeling the course of world events in the direction of detente, and normalizing interstate relations. Those taking part in the meeting expressed the conviction that, in the interests of peace and the peoples' security, it is essential in particular to impose an immediate freeze on the nuclear arms of all nuclear power, primarily the USSR and the United States.

As is well known, in accordance with instructions from the USSR Supreme Soviet, on 21 June the Soviet Government sent the governments of the United States, Britain, France, and China specific proposals that all powers possessing nuclear weapons should freeze all their nuclear arms both quantitatively and qualitatively.

What does that mean? A freeze would provide for halting the qualitative buildup of all components of the sides' nuclear arsenals, having in mind both all types of nuclear weapon delivery vehicles and all nuclear warheads. To ensure a qualitative freeze on their nuclear arms, the nuclear powers would undertake not to develop new varieties and types of nuclear arms. To erect a reliable barrier in the way of the creeping nuclear arms race, each side would introduce a moratorium on all tests of nuclear warheads and tests of new varieties and types of delivery vehicles.

The observance of freeze commitments could be effectively monitored with the aid of national technical facilities, and where necessary the nuclear powers would coordinate additional measures on the basis of cooperation.

The USSR and the United States now have the biggest nuclear arsenals. Considering this objective reality, the proposed freeze could be effected initially by the Soviet Union and the United States, with a view to other nuclear powers taking similar action. Here the Soviet side has officially stated its readiness to freeze its nuclear arms at the same time as the United States, as soon as the U.S. side is ready to do so. The Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that, given the relevant political will in other nuclear states -- primarily the United States -- the practical implementation of a freeze will not take long or require long, hard talks.

A freeze of nuclear arsenals, as the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On the international situation and the Soviet Union's foreign policy" stresses, would undoubtedly "raise the degree of trust in relations between states with nuclear weapons and make it possible to effect a resolute turn toward normalizing the overall atmosphere in the world." On the practical plane this measure would already have created a favorable climate for achieving mutually acceptable accords at the current Soviet-U.S. strategic arms limitation and reduction talks and also the talks on nuclear arms in Europe, in full accordance with the principle of equality and identical security.

It is this natural interdependence between a freeze and other measures for limiting, reducing, and ultimately eliminating nuclear arms which has made the idea of a freeze so popular among broad international public circles. The United Nations and other international and national organizations and also the organs of power of several countries and even the U.S. House of Representatives have expressed themselves in support of a freeze as a measure of "an exceptionally urgent nature" from the viewpoint of the struggle against the threat of nuclear war. The appeal of the recent third congress of "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" to the USSR and U.S. heads of state directly mentions a freeze on nuclear arsenals together with other priority steps to prevent a nuclear catastrophe. A call for a freeze on nuclear arsenals is contained in the appeal adopted by the participants in the World Assembly "For Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War" held in Prague recently.

Millions of people throughout the world supporting the freeze proposals in one form or another see in this measure not an end in itself but a turning point for the start of a movement toward a radical reduction and subsequent total elimination of nuclear arms. A guarantee of this is the detailed, gradual nuclear disarmament program put forward by the USSR together with the other fraternal socialist countries in the Warsaw Pact Prague Political Declaration and confirmed at the meeting in Moscow, as are the Soviet Union's radical proposals providing for ridding Europe altogether of medium-range and tactical nuclear arms.

But the fact that a freeze would be such a far-reaching action does not suit those Western circles, above all Washington, which have steered a course toward confrontation with the socialist world. To what arguments will they not resort to defame the very idea of halting the buildup of nuclear arsenals the White House has even gone so far as to declare that measures to curb the nuclear arms race are "immoral."

In actual fact it is the genuine -- as distinct from the publicly declared -- motives of the imperialist policy of the United States and its NATO allies which are immoral. Reaction is concerned least of all for the prosperity and security of its own people. A brochure published by the U.S. organization "Businessmen Concerned Over the Danger of Nuclear War" has calculated that a freeze on nuclear arsenals would save the United States itself at least \$100 billion by 1990. That would be enough to reduce inflation, balance the budget, and cut taxes. However, the leading monopolies of the U.S. military-industrial complex, that is, those who now determine the political complexion of the U.S. Administration, are already hankering after the billions of dollars. Not a freeze, but hundreds and thousands of new nuclear systems designed to deliver a first strike and cause even greater destabilization -- that is the White House's watchword.

But for U.S. and other extremists, agreeing to a freeze means not only losing billions of dollars for military orders but also essentially depriving themselves of a trump card in their propaganda game designed to hide their desire for nuclear superiority. Indeed, the basis of a freeze is the military-strategic equilibrium which actually exists in the world today between the USSR and the United States and the Warsaw Pact and NATO. The existence of this parity is enshrined in the relevant Soviet-U.S. accords and has frequently been acknowledged by authoritative politicians and military figures in the West, including the United States itself. The Soviet Union's "nuclear superiority," suddenly "discovered" by the Reagan administration, is just a screen for concealing the imperialist policy of strength and diktat and attempts to achieve military superiority over the USSR and its allies.

Of course, any attempts by Washington and NATO circles to gain a position of "nuclear strength" and create a threat to the USSR through superiority in any component of nuclear arms are doomed to fail. As Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed in his speech at the June Plenum: "We will continue to do everything necessary to safeguard the security of our country and of our friends and allies and will enhance the combat might of the Soviet armed forces -- a mighty factor in curbing the aggressive aspirations of imperialist reaction." If we succeeded in reducing the level of arms and military expenditure on both sides and embarking on the disarmament we are actively seeking, it would be a great blessing to all countries and peoples. It is this noble goal -- making peace firmer, diverting the threat of war, and easing the arms burden -- that guides Soviet Union and its allies in putting forward the nuclear arms freeze proposals.

WASHINGTON ARMS RACE ADVOCATES RIDICULED

PM041305 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 83 First Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Korionov "Political Observer's Notes": "Wick and Co in their Repertoire"]

[Text] Transatlantic fans of nuclear war are having a hard time. Europe is in the grip of mighty antiwar and antimissile actions. More than 70 percent of Americans support the idea of an immediate freeze on the U.S. and USSR nuclear arsenals. The ruling American clique's adventurist course is opposed by realistic-minded congressmen, clergymen, scientists, doctors, and numerous public organizations representing very different sections of the population.

American officials, the Pentagon "brass", and other advocates of nuclear weapons have a bad time at public meetings. In some places, as happened recently to vice president Bush in the West German city of Krefeld, they are pelted with stones and bottles. Bush could find nothing better to say after such a "welcome" than to declare that it was "a handful of desperate people, paid hirelings." And yet there were 20,000 people in that "handful...."

And, of course, at all meetings Washington's representatives are bombarded with a hail of questions about the White House stand on the new American medium-range nuclear weapons being imposed on West Europe. And now the USIA, headed by C. Wick, has hastened to their assistance by recently publishing the special brochure "Intermediate-range nuclear weapons: Questions and Answers." Its compilers decided to coach the American officials who are tripped up by "tricky" questions and give them a kind of crib.

U.S. Assistant Defense Secretary A. Sylvester once told journalists in a fit of frankness: "If you think that any U.S. official intends to tell you the truth, you are simply a fool." It is evident that the compilers of the said brochure adhere precisely to this "rule."

They have not troubled themselves about arguments. When, for example, they have to answer the question: "Why does the United States refuse to take into account the Russians' demands for the British and French nuclear forces to be included in the calculations?" The brochure's compilers answer without a moment's thought: "The Russians are seeking a ruse." But is the military mechanism of Britain and France and their armed forces no longer a part of the NATO bloc? This has always been the case, and it has become still more obvious since Williamsburg. Do these countries not have missiles in Europe? And at targets in which countries are they aimed? It is hard to believe they are aimed at American targets.... What "Russian ruse," then, have the hacks of C. Wicks' department detected here?

These gentlemen also have to come up against just assertions that the deployment of Pershings and Tomahawks pursues the aim of ensuring NATO's military superiority. And then they peremptorily declare: "Rubbish!" But, evidently realizing that such an exclamation is no kind of argument, the brochure's compilers then begin repeating Washington's favorite allegation about U.S. "laggardness," maintaining that there is no military parity but only a "mythical equilibrium." And yet quite recently, in June this year, even the U.S. State Department was forced to admit in its report "security and arms control": "According to any objective criteria, the Soviet Union has attained approximate equality in terms of strategic nuclear forces...." This military-strategic equilibrium between socialism and imperialism serves the cause of peaceful coexistence well, and it is precisely this that the inspirers of the arms race would like to upset. This is why the brochure's compilers are enraged by the very idea of a freeze on U.S. and Soviet nuclear arms, and they wail: "This so-called moratorium is a swindle." Why? Do not look for an answer. There is not one in the crib.

Advocates of the arms race also need prompting to answer the question: "Is the United States fully determined to carry out the deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles regardless of progress being made at the talks?" The USIA answer proclaims: "Not at all." But none other than Pentagon chief Weinberger, speaking of the prospects of reaching agreement at the Geneva talks, constantly maintains: "We act from the assumption that it cannot be concluded this year, and we are making preparations to deploy the missiles at full speed." And Secretary of State Shultz confirms: "The missiles will be deployed. The United States, like its NATO allies, wants to conduct talks with the USSR from a position of strength."

Describing the activities of Washington politicians, New York Times military-political commentator L. Gelb wrote recently: "They are, in fact, putting on a show to propitiate public opinion in the West, and accelerated rearmament remains their chief aim." The USIA opus is further confirmation of this.

NEUTRON WEAPON PRODUCTION, DEPLOYMENT BLASTED

LD011735 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0737 GMT 1 Jul 83

[Text] Washington, 1 Jul (TASS) -- The U.S. Congress approved the allocation in the next financial year of \$50 million for the production of a particularly barbarous type of mass annihilation weapon: neutron artillery charges for 155 mm howitzers.

The Reagan administration has begun serial production of neutron weapons. Having now achieved official allocations for this program, the Pentagon intends to increase its scale. Washington intends to deploy this "novelty" in West Europe, thus making the population not only a nuclear but also a "neutron hostage." THE WASHINGTON POST writes in connection with this that the new weapons are to replace about 2,000 "outdated" nuclear artillery charges for 155 mm howitzers in West Europe.

Taking account the powerful opposition from the West European public to the militarization of the continent, the administration intends to resort to frank deception of the West Europeans. As THE WASHINGTON POST writes, ordinary nuclear charges adapted to use radio active tritium which will allow them to be turned into neutron charges at any moment will be sent to the continent.

At the same time production is in full swing of two other types of neutron weapons: warheads for lance nuclear missiles deployed in West Europe and also 8-inch neutron artillery charges. It is proposed that these will also be sent to the continent but kept secret from the West Europeans.

DISARMAMENT COMMITTEE DISCUSSES MOSCOW STATEMENT

LD051646 Moscow TASS in English 1501 GMT 15 Jul 83

[Text] Geneva July 5 TASS -- The joint statement of the participants in the meeting of top party leaders and statesmen of seven socialist countries, which was held in Moscow on June 28, has given rise to close interest at the Disarmament Committee. It was distributed here as the committee's official document. The package of initiatives, contained in that important document, has a direct bearing to the pivotal problem of the present -- the problem of prevention of a nuclear war, which is now being discussed by the committee.

The participants in the Moscow meeting believe that it is most important to put an end to the arms race and come over to disarmament, particularly nuclear, in order to preserve peace, civilisation and life on earth. This was stated at the plenary meeting today by the head of the Soviet delegation Viktor Israelyan.

The Soviet representative proposed that a special working group be formed at the committee without delay on the question of prevention of a nuclear war for conducting concrete negotiations.

Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia Lazar Mojsov said in his speech that never before any weapon presented such a danger to all peoples as does the nuclear weapon. Therefore, it is necessary to reach as soon as possible an accord on the main problems of limitation of the arms race, and of disarmament, and the Disarmament Committee is bound to play a major role in that.

Gerald Rose (GDR) drew the committee members' attention to the fact that the principle of the non-use of force had been and remained the corner-stone of the foreign policy of the socialist states. Another confirmation of that, he said, are the initiatives and proposals contained in the Prague Political Declaration and the joint statement of the participants in the Moscow meeting of leaders of the socialist countries.

The GDR representative emphasised that the progress at negotiations on disarmament depended whether the United States and NATO would seek, as before, military superiority or strive for honest mutually-acceptable accords.

UN MEETING ON PEACEFUL USE OF OUTER SPACE ENDS

LD012320 Moscow TASS in English 2212 GMT 1 Jul 83

[Text] New York July 2 TASS -- The United Nations committee on peaceful use of outer space has closed its annual session here. It stressed the need to develop international cooperation in this new sphere of human activity. Members of the committee -- official representatives of 53 countries -- discussed technical and legal aspects of such topical problems as remote probing of earth by satellites, development of space transportation systems, direct television broadcasting, delineation of air and cosmic space.

The official agenda of the committee did not include the issue of military threat in outer space, still it was in the focus of debates at the session. P. Jankowicz (Austria), chairman of the committee, told a press conference at the U.N. Headquarters that nearly all participants in the discussion share the opinion that urgent measures are needed to prevent the arms race in outer space.

Statements by many delegates revealed that the Pentagon's star war plans and its concrete decisions to develop new weaponry systems designed to wage such a war give cause for universal concern.

*Star War' Plans Deplored

LD022344 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1026 GMT 2 Jul 83

[Excerpts] New York, 2 Jul (TASS) -- The annual session of the UN committee on the use of space for peaceful means, having stressed the need for the development of cooperation among countries in that sphere of human activity, has ended at UN headquarters. The members of the committee discussed the technical and legal aspects of such topical problems as exploration of the earth with the assistance of satellites, development of space transport systems, direct television broadcasting, and the demarcation of air and cosmic space.

The question of the militarization of the cosmos did not feature on the official agenda of the session. However, it was at the center of attention of delegates from practically all states.

The speeches of many delegates showed that the Pentagon's plans, being worked out, to wage a "star war," and the decisions taken by Washington to develop new weapons systems to be deployed in space near earth, are causing general concern. Data produced at the session on the rapid growth of the "space" budget of the U.S. war department, on the planned use of the shuttle-series space-ship for militaristic aims, attests to the scale of American preparations.

The Soviet delegation at the session of the committee confirmed the readiness of the USSR to come to an agreement forbidding the deployment of weapons of any kind in space, and forbidding in general the use of force both in space itself and also from space in the direction of earth.

BOGOMOLOV REVIEWS CEMA INTEGRATION PROCESS

PM291504 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Jun 83 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Academician O. Bogomolov: "In the Interests of the Whole Community"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee June Plenum has once again stressed that the strengthening of cooperation and cohesion among the socialist countries is the prime direction of the international activity of the CPSU and the Soviet State. "As far as our closest friends and allies -- the socialist community countries -- are concerned," Comrade Yu.V. Andropov noted in this plenum speech, "we share the opinion: that life demands not simply an expansion of cooperation, but an improvement in its quality and effectiveness, too."

As applied to economic cooperation, this means a higher degree of coordination of the CEMA member-countries' economic policy, the involvement of enterprises and associations in direct integration links and in production and scientific-technical cooperation, and an increase in real economic advantages for each participant in integration.

In other words, the international socialist division of labor and the resulting economic links will be transformed into an even more powerful lever of the socioeconomic progress and political consolidation of CEMA member-countries.

The scientific and technical revolution has added new factors to the traditional ones of the international division of labor and economic integration, and they are conditional on the high concentration and technical level of equipment of modern-day production and its growing science-intensiveness. It has accelerated the process of internationalizing economic life and lent it a qualitatively new significance in ensuring the growth of social labor productivity.

The industrial products list and its technical complexity, especially in machine building, electronics and chemistry, are so great, and the need to cut costs on the basis of concentration and increasing series production is so urgent, that even the largest and most developed states cannot produce a complete range of products efficiently. This is also prevented by increased expenditures on scientific research and experimental design projects and on the effective introduction of their results into practice. All this makes international specialization and cooperation between production and scientific-technical development essential and transforms these into a necessary condition for improving the effectiveness of economic activity.

It is not surprising that the CEMA member-countries link, with the further deepening of the international socialist division of labor and economic integration the resolution of the most urgent tasks of their own development, especially the tasks of intensifying the economy and accelerating scientific and technical progress. Here, they assign the leading place in their strategy of cooperation for the 1980's and 1990's to cooperation between production, science and technology. This is connected primarily with the fact that the potential for further deepening the division of labor in the fuel and raw materials sectors is limited, but the potential for cooperation in the introduction of source-saving technologies and in the output of modern, highly productive machines, instruments and consumer goods for the population is virtually unlimited. The CEMA countries already have considerable experience at their disposal in this sphere. Here are a few examples.

On the basis of a jointly elaborated long-term program, the CEMA countries have developed a powerful international production complex producing computer hardware; a unified computer system -- Ryad -- has been developed, with technical, information and program compatibility. Some 30 scientific research and design bureaus and more than 70 plants employing more than 300,000 people are working according to the coordinated plan.

The multilateral agreement on international specialization, production sharing, and mutual deliveries of equipment for nuclear power stations for 1981-1990 is equally large-scale in nature. Taking part in implementing it are 50 major enterprises of the CEMA countries and the SFRY, among which cooperation links have been established and the comprehensive unification and standardization of production of individual elements of equipment is taking place.

The agreement envisages that the Soviet Union will produce half the basic equipment covered by the agreement and the CEMA countries the other half. For example, Czechoslovakia is to supply power reactors, steam turbines, separator-steam superheaters, and feed pumps. Romania is to supply emergency equipment systems and overhead cranes. Poland is to supply compressors, heat-exchange equipment, and reserve diesel powerplants. The GDR is to supply biological protection equipment. The SFRY is to supply overhead cranes and feed and special pumps. As a result of the implementation of the outlined cooperation program, it is planned to construct atomic powerplants of more than 30 gigawatts capacity in the CEMA countries (excluding the USSR) in the period through 1990.

The multilateral agreement among the CEMA countries on production sharing in energy-intensive and less energy-intensive chemical products also serves as an example of broad cooperation on the basis of the rational division of labor. This cooperation, calculated up to 1995, provides the participants with several advantages, making it easier to resolve energy problems in countries with limited fuel reserves and making it easier to meet needs for the whole diverse range of chemical products in the fuel-rich countries.

As a result of the coordination of economic plans, a profile is gradually being built up of the export specialization and national machine-building complexes within the framework of the CEMA community. As examples, we can point to the production of battery-operated trucks and electric hoisting trolleys [elektrotelfery] in Bulgaria; buses and units for motor vehicles, low-current apparatus and instruments in Hungary; ships, equipment for the chemical and textile industry, forging and pressing and printing machines, and passenger railroad cars in the GDR; ships and hoisting and transport and road-building machines in Poland; equipment for oil extraction and blast furnaces in Romania; and large-capacity trucks and chemical equipment in Czechoslovakia.

Naturally, Soviet machine building is universal in character and works chiefly for the huge domestic market. However, in a number of its sectors the export quota is growing steadily. For example, in the motor vehicle and electrical equipment industry, road-building and agricultural machine building, machine-tool building, and the production of metallurgical equipment.

The development of economic integration among the CEMA countries and increasing trade among them in the current decade will depend to a large extent on the exposure of as yet unused possibilities for production and scientific-technical cooperation in the manufacturing sectors of industry, the agro-industrial complex and the services sphere. In the opinion of these countries, the way to this lies through the coordination of economic strategy directives. Without this, it is difficult to achieve a rational complementarity among national machine-building, metallurgical, and chemical complexes and to eliminate unjustified parallelism in production capacities.

In the sphere of scientific and technical progress, where the chief lever for improving economic efficiency is to be found, a deeper unification than before and mutual increase of the countries' potentials are imminent in the 1980's and 1990's. The first step toward this is the coordination of strategy for the development of science and technology.

The CEMA countries have singled out a number of priority directions for scientific and technical progress in the 1980's. These include the automation of production processes on the basis of the use of promising computer hardware, primarily micro- and mini-computers; the development of programmed control systems; the creation of a standardized component base for electronic equipment; the introduction of robot-manipulators and other means of mechanization of labor-intensive processes; the creation of powerful equipment complexes for exploiting fuel and raw material deposits and their transportation; the development of machines and equipment ensuring the economic utilization of fuel and energy; the modernization of the machine-building pool on the basis of highly productive precision equipment; and the creation of a comprehensive standardized series of hydraulic systems and pneumatic tires.

It is intended that the different countries give preference to these directions. Moreover, each country will be able, taking advantage of integration cooperation, to concentrate its scientific and technical potential on those of the aforementioned priority directions for which it has the best preconditions. The USSR's powerful scientific and technical potential will be the core of the outlined cooperation plans.

The realization of plans for the future will be determined to a large extent by how closely cooperation in science and technology succeeds in being unified with production sharing. It is important to conduct matters so that the results of scientific and technical cooperation become the point of departure for the assimilation and output of modern products on a cooperation basis. With this aim in view, it is intended to improve the forms and economic machinery of cooperation and to develop direct links among the CEMA countries' production and economic organizations. It is further intended to create joint firms and enterprises and expand the scope of competence of already operating international economic organizations of the Interkhim or Argromash type in the CEMA countries.

In deepening integration cooperation with each other on the basis of scientific and technical and production cooperation, the CEMA countries are striving not just to meet their own needs better, but also to improve the competitiveness of their products on Western markets and create the preconditions for the expansion of mutually advantageous East-West business links. In directing their efforts to the joint solution of the most important problems of technical progress and the improvement of the economy's structure, they are bringing into operation an important lever for the intensification of their own development.

COMMUNIQUE ISSUED ON CEMA EXECUTIVE SESSION

PM041428 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 83 First Edition p 4

["Communique on the 106th CEMA Executive Committee Session"]

[Text] The 10th CEMA Executive Committee Session was held in Moscow 28-30 June 1983.

Participating in the session were representatives of the countries on the Executive Committee, deputy heads of government: A. Lcbanov of Bulgaria, J. Marjai of Hungary, Tran Quynh of the SRV, G. Weiss of the GDR, J. Domenech of Cuba, M. Peljee of Mongolia, Z. Madej of Poland, I. Totu of Romania, N.V. Talyzin of the USSR, and R. Rohlicek of the CSSR.

In accordance with an agreement between CEMA and the SFRY Government, M. Pejevski, member of the Federal Executive Council and SFRY permanent representative at CEMA, participated in the work of the Executive Committee.

Council Secretary N.V. Faddeyev participated in the work of the Executive Committee.

The session was chaired by G. Weiss, GDR representative on the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee examined materials on questions of broadening the CEMA countries' cooperation in the sphere of the rational utilization of fuel, energy, and raw material resources and also in improving the supply of foodstuffs to the population. A decision was adopted to submit these materials to the CEMA session.

In connection with preparing a report on CEMA activity during the period since the 26th Council Session it was pointed out at the session that the CEMA countries, realizing the targets set by communist and workers parties for the current 5-year plan, have achieved further growth in national income and in the production of industrial and agricultural output.

The Executive Committee approved a list of problems to be examined on a multilateral basis in the course of coordinating national economic plans for the coming 5-year plan, with a view to focusing the attention of the CEMA countries and council organs on cooperation in resolving very important economic, scientific, and technical questions, particularly in the sphere of developing fuel and raw material sectors, electricity generation, ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy, machine building, the electronics and chemical industries, and transportation.

Progress in fulfilling the general agreement signed in 1982 on multilateral cooperation in developing and organizing the specialized and collaborative production of industrial robots was examined. It was pointed out that the CEMA countries are implementing programs for the introduction of robots into the national economy. A concerted concept of the development of robot engineering has been determined within the CEMA framework, and work is being done to standardize designs of industrial robots. The Executive Committee defined targets for ensuring the further realization of the aforementioned general agreement.

Other questions of cooperation were examined, and corresponding resolutions adopted on them.

The session took place in an atmosphere of friendship and comradely mutual understanding.

PRAVDA ON MOSCOW SUMMIT, ASEAN, UNCTAD MEETINGS

PM051323 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jul 83 First Edition p 4

[Vsevolod Ovchinnikov "International Review"]

[Text] Love of Peace and Confidence

The past week has been a vivid illustration of the words heard at the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum that it is socialism in our era that acts as the most consistent defender of sound principles in international relations, the defender of the interests of detente and peace, the interests of all people and all mankind. New evidence of the socialist community's peace-loving aspirations was provided by the meeting of leading party and state figures from Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Romania, the USSR, and the CSSR that was held in Moscow on 28 June.

The joint statement adopted at the meeting expresses the unity of the approach of the fraternal parties and states to evaluating the present-day international situation, and their striving to pool their efforts to avert the threat of war and consolidate peace and the peoples' security. Such a unity of approach on these issues is particularly important when the buildup of tension and the further destabilization of interstate relations are continuing, when the threat of nuclear war with its catastrophic consequences is increasing, and when the arms race is acquiring an unprecedented scale. The United States and some of its allies are not hiding their desire to regain military superiority over the socialist countries. In addition, they have gone over to practical actions to attain that aim.

Under these conditions, the socialist countries' statement, proceeding from the interests of peace and their own security, that they will not on any account permit military superiority to be gained over them is of particular importance. The participants in the Moscow meeting addressed an urgent appeal to the North Atlantic alliance members to soberly and objectively weigh up the ominous trends in the present development of international relations and to draw rational conclusions which are in mankind's most profound interests.

The elimination of confrontation on the European continent has now acquired very great significance. The deployment of new U.S. medium-range missiles on Western European territory planned for the end of the year would produce a serious change in the military-political situation not only on a regional, but also on a global scale. Washington is disguising its line of disrupting the Geneva talks not just behind demagoguery about the alleged "flexibility" of its position, but also behind false assertions that by merely beginning to deploy missiles it might be possible to prompt the Soviet Union to make concessions and to break the deadlock. Counting on that means either engaging in self-deception or deluding the public. The only possible realistic aim is to reach an agreement this year that would rule out the deployment of the new U.S. missiles in the West European countries and would envisage corresponding reductions in the medium-range facilities existing in Europe, in other words -- to ensure equilibrium at the lowest possible level.

The responses of the world's press note the broad range of constructive ideas and proposals put forward by the Moscow meeting participants. The socialist community countries spoke against the militarization of space and for the urgent freezing of the nuclear weapons of all the nuclear powers, above all the USSR and the United States. They advocated that those nuclear powers that have not yet done so should commit themselves not to be first to use nuclear weapons. They again called on the NATO members not to increase and subsequently to reciprocally reduce military spending and to begin the formulation of a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force beginning next year.

The participants in the meeting opposed the expansion of new military-political groupings and advocated the creation of nuclear-free zones and a productive conclusion to the Madrid meeting. Stressing that present-day European territorial and political realities are inviolable, they called for Europe to be transformed into a continent of peace free of nuclear weapons where all states could cooperate on the basis of full equality and mutual respect, in the interests of progress and their peoples' prosperity.

Commenting on the joint statement adopted in Moscow, the fraternal countries' press notes that the socialist community's peoples expect the NATO members to respond to that appeal. The whole world expects practical moves capable of averting the worst at this complex time in the development of international events.

Hitched to the Team

A routine conference of ASEAN countries' foreign ministers has been held in Bangkok. At first the representatives of Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia, and Singapore conferred among themselves and then, according to the practice established in recent years, were joined by the heads of the U.S., Japanese, FRG, Canadian, Australian, and New Zealand foreign policy departments. U.S. Secretary of State Shultz also timed his Asian tour to coincide with the Bangkok conference and included India and Pakistan on his itinerary in addition to Thailand and the Philippines.

As at previous such meetings the main theme of the discussion was the situation in Southeast Asia. There is undoubtedly real potential for improving it. That potential has been created, in particular, by the patient and constructive approach of Indochina's socialist states to the region's problems and by such impressive displays of good will on their part as the partial withdrawal of Vietnamese volunteers from Kampuchea in the past two years. The positive results of the recent trip by Vietnam's foreign minister to the Philippines and Thailand were of great significance. None of this passes without trace. The ASEAN countries are increasingly realizing that dialogue with the Indochinese states is the only path toward peace and stability in Southeast Asia.

Was that trend reflected in the Bangkok conference? Alas, it was not. The United States and its sympathizers again diverted the ASEAN representatives onto the futile path of discussing the "Kampuchean problem" -- in other words, the path of support for the Pol Potites and other reactionary Khmer gangs. As Hanoi's NHAN DAN rightly believes, the decisions taken in Bangkok effectively ignore the good will shown by the SRV and the PRK. Those decisions merely play into the hands of those forces which are trying to urge the Indochinese states and ASEAN countries onto the path of confrontation. The conference communique deliberately sidesteps the point that external interference in the affairs of the region's states is the real cause of the worsening of tension in Southeast Asia. Indeed, it was with that aim that Secretary of State Shultz also went to Bangkok.

The conference confirmed the acute exacerbation of the trade and economic conflicts between the ASEAN members and the leading capitalist powers. While playing up to the ASEAN countries, the United States and its allies do not want at all to abandon their neocolonialist methods of trading with them. They are continuing to take the raw materials they need from the region but obstruct the sale on their own markets of finished goods made there.

Avoiding discussing problems that displeased Washington, the Bangkok conference repeated the scenario previously rehearsed at Williamsburg. The United States and its allies tried to conceal their interference and neocolonialist ways behind bluster about "strengthening the security" of the ASEAN countries. By exploiting the "Kampuchean problem," they are urging those countries toward turning ASEAN into a military-political grouping which would be yet another link in the chain of aggressive blocs and an instrument of imperialist intrigues.

A single line can be seen in the attempts to subordinate various forms of interstate contacts to the service of Washington's imperial ambitions. Take, for example, the annual meetings of the "big seven." They were conceived to iron out trade and economic contradictions among the leading capitalist powers, but the United States is trying to turn them into a mechanism for formulating a common foreign policy strategy. For example, the joint statement on military policy issues adopted at Williamsburg was a step toward the "nationalization" of Japan, which does not belong to the North Atlantic bloc.

The Western powers' appeals in Bangkok to give ASEAN a political character recall somewhat the thrust of the recent Common Market countries' meeting in Stuttgart. The requirement facing the heads of their states and governments was to resolve the mass of contradictions and disputes that divide the "ten." Instead they stressed the attention paid to a "solemn declaration on the European alliance" which raises the question of broadening consultations within the foreign policy sphere, including security problems, that is, essentially the "nationalization" of the EEC.

The search for extra means of influence on the alliance countries has also engendered a desire to hitch the right-wing parties in their political arena to the general team. The proclamation of the so-called "International Democrat Union" was timed to coincide with the beginning of U.S. Vice President Bush's trip to Western Europe. Conservative parties in the United States, Britain, the FRG, Japan, and other countries formed this association so as to coordinate more closely the anti-Soviet and anti-communist moves in Reagan's "crusade" and to agree on measures to pressure the left-wing forces and counter the antiwar movement.

Washington is stepping up its attempts to subordinate other countries to its dangerous course, even including those countries which are unconnected with the United States by either multilateral or bilateral alliances. Furthermore, there are increasing signs that the United States is heading toward the creation of a global military-political coalition aimed against the USSR and the other socialist states.

President Reagan's intended November visit to Japan, South Korea, and Indonesia, recently announced by the White House, can also be seen as one of those signs. In the opinion of the newspaper MAINICHI, the very itinerary of this trip "implies the ultimate creation of an anti-Soviet bloc." There are indeed quite a few justifications for such a conclusion. The "nationalization" of Japan, that is, its involvement in the Pentagon's global strategy, the attempts to merge the U.S. bilateral military agreements with Japan and South Korea into a Washington-Tokyo Seoul triangle, and the plans for the creation of a "Pacific Community" in which there are also attempts to enlist the ASEAN members, including Indonesia, in addition the members of imperialist military blocs -- all of this can be seen as steps toward knocking together such a coalition.

Failed Expectations

The work of the sixth UNCTAD conference session has come to an end in Belgrade. That forum, where virtually the entire international community is represented, is designed specifically to promote the acceleration of economic growth among the developing countries. Some 117 speakers took part in the general discussion at the session. The Soviet side confirmed that the USSR expresses solidarity with the liberated states' struggle to strengthen their independence and sovereignty and that it consistently supports the restructuring of world economic ties on a just and democratic basis.

After all, even though the Asian, African, and Latin American peoples have smashed the claims of colonial oppression, the mechanism for enslaving them economically and for plundering their natural wealth has continued to function. The developing countries are receiving less and less for the raw materials they sell and are paying more and more for the industrial goods they buy. In the past 3-4 years alone the size of their foreign debt has doubled and exceeds \$600 billion.

The liberated states are striving for a radical reexamination of the entire package of problems which give rise to inequality and injustice in world economic ties. It was on their initiative that the UN General Assembly back in 1979 adopted a resolution which envisages holding global talks within the UN framework on the crucial problems of establishing a new international economic order. For 4 years now, however, the Western states, especially the United States, have been sabotaging the implementation of that resolution. That is being accompanied by cynical demagoguery to the effect that for the liberated states there is no better way of overcoming backwardness than by renouncing the principles of economic planning and any form of state economic regulation and by opening their doors wide to the multinationals. "International capital," the SFRY journal DANAS writes, "is trying to convince the developing countries in Belgrade that virtually all their problems can be resolved if a favorable climate for foreign capital investment is created. Such calls are aimed at a return to economic neocolonialism with its deplorable political consequences."

The expectations which the Asian, African, and Latin American countries pinned on the latest UNCTAD session did not materialize. "After 4 weeks of talks in Belgrade," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, "an unbridgeable gulf lies between the positions of the developed and the developing countries."

In an attempt to kill off the idea of global talks, Washington is striving to return the discussion to the plane of separate problems and individual regions and countries, and also to transfer it from the United Nations to organs that are obedient to the West such as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the IMF, where decisions are taken not according to numbers of votes but according to the size of a country's payments.

"Deliberate, cynical arrogance," was how THE TIMES OF INDIA characterized the U.S. stance at the sixth UNCTAD session. In the newspaper's words, the U.S. delegation pursued the same line in Belgrade as Reagan imposed on the participants in the Williamsburg meeting by asserting that there is no need for a reform of the international financial system or the terms of world trade. The United States simply wants to perpetuate the present situation whereby the developing countries' interests are infringed.

The work of the sixth UNCTAD session again demonstrated that the policy of domination and dictatorship pursued by the imperialist powers is contrary to the fundamental interests of the states that have freed themselves from colonial and semicolonial dependence.

BELGRADE UNCTAD CONFERENCE COMPLETES WORK

LD032212 Moscow TASS in English 1803 GMT 3 Jul 83

[Text] Belgrade July 3 TASS -- The sixth session of the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) has closed here today. The session was attended by representatives of 160 countries and many inter-governmental and non-governmental organisations. On the agenda of the session was a number of important issues, among them the state of the world economy and its prospects for the eighties, trade in raw materials, trade policy, trade and economic relations between countries with different socio-economic systems, monetary financial problems, aid to the national liberation movements, and others.

The delegates to the forum adopted a resolution on the state of the world economy stressing that the economic future and political stability of the developed and developing countries are interlinked. The resolution points to the need of joint efforts of all states for ending the world economic crisis, intensifying international economic cooperation, and contains specific proposals for the attainment of these aims.

At the same time observers point out that the text of the resolution does not include many of the demands and proposals put forward by the developing countries. This is a result of the stand of the developed Western states, which voted for the resolution and then dissociated themselves from it. The U.S. representative said, quoting participants in the meeting at Williamsburg, that this resolution is "ideologically unacceptable" to the USA and that it is allegedly too negative in evaluating the state of the world economy. The U.S. stand had the support of representatives of other Western countries.

The session has also passed a resolution on economic cooperation with the developing countries, on aid to the peoples of Palestine, Namibia, and South Africa, on aid to Lebanon, which seriously suffered as a result of the Israeli aggression.

The conference has drawn the attention of all peoples and countries to the increased threat to peace and the need for countering the aggravation of international tensions, for putting a stop to the arms race, above all nuclear arms, that is dangerous to the entire mankind, and the funds now spent on arms should be used for the economic and social progress of the peoples, on reversing the world back to detente and cooperation.

Addressing a press conference here, Gamani Corea, UNCTAD secretary general, expressed on the whole satisfaction with the results of the session. He pointed out that the sixth UNCTAD session ended in reaching accord on most issues which were included into the agenda, in the first place on key issues of trade, raw materials, and finance.

U.S. Delegate's Speech Hit

LD051631 Moscow TASS in English 1200 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS -- TASS commentator Ivan Ablamov writes:

The representative of the United States in his speech at the sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) held in Belgrade referred to the decision of the Williamsburg Summit and said that the resolution adopted by the participants in the conference on the state of the world economy was "ideologically unacceptable" and too negatively assessed the situation in the world economy. Why does this resolution displease the delegates of the United States and other Western countries? Because it says that peace and development cannot be divorced, because the document stresses the need of joint efforts by all states to overcome the economic crisis, because it contains concrete proposals in this direction, specifically taking into consideration the proposals of the developing countries.

There is nothing amazing in this position. The United States heads the ever stronger frontal onslaught by the West on the interests of the liberated states. One can refer to the hostile reception by the "big seven" in Williamsburg to the appeal by the Delhi conference of nonaligned countries for global talks for the sake of establishing a new just order in international economic relations.

Defining the aims of the developing countries, THE TIMES OF INDIA wrote at the very beginning of the Belgrade conference:

The existing system of international trade, financing, transfer of technology has outlived itself and is more aimed at safeguarding the interests of industrially developed countries than at promoting self-sufficiency of developing countries. It is not surprising that the United States and the other Western powers made no concessions at Belgrade even on a single of those problems. The United States asserts that there is allegedly no necessity of reforming that international financial system and the conditions of world trade -- the system which led to the monstrous 630,000 million dollars foreign debts of the young states! At the end of last year this debt exceeded by 30 percent the total volume of exports of goods and services by the states of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Washington mockingly urges the developing countries to "bear it", to wait until the economic situation in the West improves and leads to the expansion of world trade which is being conducted on evermore unequal conditions for the developing countries. In the last two years alone the prices of their exports dropped 28 percent. At the same time the production of the young states encounters ever growing protectionist barriers in the West.

Already at the time of the Belgrade conference, when the American representatives stinted no fine words about "free trade", the United States introduced restrictions on the import of textiles from India and other countries of Asia, factually barring them access to the American market. The liberated countries were compelled to assume new debts to cover the already existing and compensate the trade deficit.

"Aid" from the United States and other Western countries, as the TIMES OF ZAMBIA aptly notes, places the young states into increasing dependence on the transnational corporations. Now these corporations directly or indirectly control the production of about 80 percent of mineral resources in developing countries. This enables them not only to pump out enormous profits but also to lower prices on raw materials exported by the young states. It is not difficult to guess that the calls by the Reagan administration to the young states to rely on foreign private capital investments have the purpose to strength this neocolonialist domination.

It is precisely this system of neocolonialism that the West seeks to save from the breakup.

KOVALEV, SPANISH FOREIGN MINISTER MORAN MEET

LD301041 Moscow TASS in English 0902 GMT 30 Jun 83

[Text] Madrid June 30 TASS -- The Foreign Minister of Spain Fernando Moran had a meeting on Wednesday with the head of the Soviet delegation to the Madrid meeting, Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR Anatoliy Kovalev. Questions of the work of the Madrid meeting, and its completion were discussed. The talk was held in a constructive spirit.

KOVALEV ADDRESSES MADRID CSCE MEETING

LD011657 Moscow TASS in English 1645 GMT 1 Jul 83

[Text] Madrid July 1 TASS -- A plenary session was held today at the Madrid meeting of the states-participants in the Conference on European Security and Cooperation. Representatives of many delegations have described that session as an important one and contributing towards the speediest completion of the meeting.

The session was addressed by Anatoliy Kovalev, the head of the Soviet delegation, USSR deputy foreign minister.

A meeting of party and state leaders of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Romania, the USSR, and Czechoslovakia has just ended in Moscow, he said. The meeting stressed the significance and need for the speediest completion of the Madrid meeting with positive results according to the expectations of the European nations, and ensuring the convocation of a conference on confidence-building measures, security, and disarmament in Europe, continuity of the many-sided process, which was started in Helsinki. "This would be an important contribution to firmly asserting the policy of peace, detente, and cooperation," the joint statement goes on to say.

As the Soviet representative pointed out, the leaders of the socialist countries stressed that for the attainment of specific agreements on long ripe questions it is necessary to make every effort, conduct talks in a businesslike manner and in a positive spirit, take steps contributing to the creation of a favorable atmosphere for their progress, and not to make moves that could complicate them. This is precisely by what the USSR delegation is guided at the Madrid meeting.

As is generally known, the head of the USSR delegation continued, the Soviet Union has given consent to the draft renewed final document of the neutral and nonaligned countries the way it was tabled by its authors. Recently the government of the host country of the Madrid meeting came out with the initiative, explained by its striving for a quest for a compromise, that the meeting of representatives of 35 states which signed the Helsinki Final Accord should end with positive results soon. The Soviet delegation is ready to act within the framework of the Spanish Government's initiative, act so as to find by joint efforts mutually acceptable opportunities. In so doing, we proceed from the premise that all of our partners will also act constructively, displaying a sense of high responsibility and meeting their pledges, i.e. conduct talks and maintain contacts in a fair manner on the remaining outstanding issues.

In conclusion, the head of the Soviet delegation said, I would like to attract attention to the very important idea, which has just been underlined by Yuriy Andropov, the need for "preserving and multiplying what was achieved during the years of detente." Despite all the complexities of the present-day international situation, its seeming hopelessness, in our opinion there is real hope that the completion of the Madrid meeting can make its valuable contribution to resolving this history-making problem.

The head of the Spanish delegation pointed out in his speech the constructive character of the statement by the USSR delegation. The statements by the heads of the delegations of Greece, the latter was speaking on behalf of the countries of the "ten", and Malta were going in the same direction. The speech by the head of the U.S. delegation was in a favorable spirit, although with some nuances.

'HOPE' APPARENT FOR SUCCESSFUL END TO CSCE SESSION

LD050720 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1915 GMT 4 Jul 83

[Text] It has been reported from Madrid that today the Spanish press is providing lively comment on the results of the latest plenary session of the Madrid meeting of states participating in the CSCE. Most observers describe the session as an important one which will help in moving toward a quick completion of the meeting.

It is true, notes international affairs journalist Eduard Kovalev in connection with this, that in the Spanish capital hopes have recently been revived for a successful completion of the Madrid meeting. In the corridors these hopes are being linked with the position adopted by the socialist countries, especially that of the USSR, and attention is drawn to the speech made by the head of the Soviet delegation on 1 July.

You will recall that at the recent meeting in Moscow of party and state officials from seven socialist countries, the need was stressed for a quick completion of the Madrid meeting with positive results.

What must be done to achieve this? As the Soviet representative noted, the path to success lies in making the maximum effort, conducting the talks in a businesslike way and in a positive spirit, creating a favorable atmosphere for the progress of the talks, and at any rate not taking any action which might complicate them. The head of the Soviet delegation recalled that the USSR has already given its agreement to a draft renewed final documents in the form in which it was presented by its authors, the neutral and nonaligned countries.

However, this manifestation of a political will for agreement by the USSR was not given its due by certain Western delegations, particularly the United States, although many Western countries thought this Soviet initiative could open a way out of the deadend.

A few days ago, the Spanish Government, which is chairing the Madrid meeting, announced a new proposal in an attempt to reach a compromise. At the latest plenary session the Soviet representative stated that the Soviet delegation is ready to act within the framework of the Spanish proposal in order to make it possible to finally complete the meeting. The USSR hopes that all its partners at the meeting will also act in a similar constructive manner. It is now up to the West.

Commenting on the USSR's position, most observers in Madrid emphasize that thanks to this, a real hope has been created for a successful and immediate completion of the Madrid meeting. The USSR's position was highly evaluated by the Spanish delegation, also by the Greek delegation, which made a statement on behalf of the countries of the European Ten, and finally by the Maltese delegation which, as is known, is one of the authors of the draft final document. The situation which now exists allows us to hope for a successful and immediate completion of the Madrid meeting, if the Western powers also, especially the United States, at last show the political will for this.

CONTRAST BETWEEN WARSAW PACT, NATO VIEWED

LD012329 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 1 Jul 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Excerpts] Hello, comrades. In our alarming times there is no more important problem than curbing the arms race.

We have taken a solemn pledge never to be the first to use nuclear weapons. We call on the other nuclear powers to follow this noble example. We propose immediate implementation of a freeze on the nuclear weapons of all the nuclear countries, above all the USSR and the United States. We propose concrete ways to achieve an appreciable reduction, or, better still, the abolition of nuclear weapons in Europe. We propose a mutual reduction of military expenditure, mutual nonuse of force, the setting up of a nuclear-free zone in Central Europe, in the Balkans, and in other regions of the European Continent.

But what do we hear from Washington, and from some of the other capitals of the NATO countries? There is no need, I think, to speak about this at length -- the facts are common knowledge. Allow me, all the same, to quote reports of some of the events that took place in the NATO capitals on 28 June, that is, on the very same day that the joint statement of the socialist states was issued in Moscow.

On that day, Washington announced the allocation, of an extra sum of just over \$2 billion for the production of the B-1 strategic bomber in response to a demand by Reagan. In London they announced Britain's new military budget, which far exceeds all previous military budgets. In Paris, France proclaimed its willingness and determination to begin production of neutron weapons. In Bonn it was stated that the new U.S. nuclear missiles will definitely be sited on the territory of the Federal Republic by the end of this year unless a miracle happens in Geneva.

I repeat, comrades: All this was on just 1 day -- the very same day that from Moscow the call for peace and reason sounded anew, and with such authority.

It is true that, as the news agencies write, the White House came to the conclusion some time ago that the reputation of the present master of the White House as a warmonger is harming America's prestige, and that it would be as well to change the tone. But what difference has this change of tone made? They talk about arms control, and continue to press ahead frantically with the nuclear missile arms race. They swear that they love peace, but worship their MX's, Tridents, and Pershings. They speak of flexibility, but step up with all their might their shameful anticommunist and anti-Soviet crusade.

No, that is not what is needed in international affairs today. Today, there is still time to avert the worst. But that is only possible if there is a sincere willingness to reach mutually acceptable solutions, to unite the efforts of all countries and peoples in the struggle for peace. That is precisely what the participants of the Moscow meeting have called for in their joint statement.

U.S. CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION VISITS, VIEWS TIES

Leaves Leningrad for Moscow

PM051421 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Text] Leningrad, 4 Jul -- A delegation from the U.S. House of Representatives headed by Thomas S. Foley, majority whip of the Democrats in the House of Representatives, has completed its stay in Leningrad.

At the Piskarev memorial cemetery the guests laid a wreath at the monument to the motherland. An inscription left in the memorial's honorary visitors' book expressed "the deepest respect for the defenders of Leningrad." "Their feat," the text continues, "is one of the greatest examples of heroic struggle in all world history."

At the Smolnyy Institute the U.S. congressmen viewed the V.I. Lenin Memorial Museum. They visited the Hermitage and made a trip to the Petrodvorets.

During conversations the head of the delegation noted that the U.S. people fully share Soviet people's conviction regarding the inadmissibility of a nuclear catastrophe whose horrors cannot even be imagined. It is necessary to avoid a conflict which could lead to war and to find constructive solutions in the field of arms limitation and the safeguarding of security for the whole world.

On 4 July the delegation left Leningrad for Moscow. At the airport it was seen off by V.P. Ruben, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities; G.A. Arbatov, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Soviet of nationalities foreign affairs Commission and director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States and Canada; and other officials.

Visits USSR Supreme Soviet

LD051527 Moscow TASS in English 1156 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS -- At the Supreme Soviet of the USSR a get together took place today with a delegation of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, headed by Thomas Foley, the deputy leader of the Democrats in the House of Representatives.

Welcoming the guests, Vitaliy Ruben, the chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, expressed the hope that the visit by the delegation would promote better understanding between the peoples of the USSR and the USA.

The attention of the representatives was drawn to the general line of the CPSU and the Soviet state in foreign affairs, aimed at ending the arms race, preventing confrontation, at reviving and extending detente, at peaceful coexistence and mutually-advantageous cooperation between all states, including the Soviet Union and the USA.

This line has been reaffirmed at the recent regular session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. It was emphasized that in the overall complex of international relations of our time Soviet-American relations play a special part. Their state considerably determines along what road the international situation will further develop -- towards dangerous heightening of tension or towards understandings on the principal problems, hence, towards cooperation and international security. That is why the leadership of the USSR approaches Soviet-American relations with all responsibility, strives for their development in a spirit of cooperation, believes that this is possible in spite of existing differences and different social systems.

A wide range of questions of Soviet-American relations, limitation of armaments and a number of other problems were discussed during the talk with members of the delegation.

The talks will be continued.

Ruben Addresses Delegation

LD051615 Moscow TASS in English 1540 GMT 5 Jul 83

["Urgent Tasks in the Prevention of a Nuclear War and in the Limitation of Arms" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, July 5 TASS -- We attach much importance to interparliamentary contacts, including those with the Congress of the USA. Members of legislative bodies can and are called upon to exert substantial influence on foreign policy. This is of particular importance in our anxious time when the international atmosphere is strained and there is a real danger of slipping down to a nuclear conflict, Vitaliy Ruben, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, stated today at a meeting with a delegation of the House of Representatives of U.S. Congress.

I believe, that there can be no two ways about the estimate of the general state of Soviet-U.S. relations. The relations develop in a strained way. We representatives of the Soviet people want these relations to get right, and as soon as possible, too.

Today our peoples have a common enemy -- the threat of a war catastrophe, Vitaliy Ruben said. This must be taken into account in the basic principles of mutual restraint, in the basic principles of a search for accords which would be acceptable to both sides and would not infringe either upon the interests or security of each other. The destiny of peace depends first of all on constructive cooperation between the USSR and the USA in major matters of nuclear arms limitation.

Therefore the leadership of the USSR approaches Soviet-U.S. relations in a very responsible way and steers a course towards development of good relations between our countries. We hold that this is possible despite competition and rivalry in the economic, social and ideological fields. The principle of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems is the basic principle of our foreign policy. The course towards detente, disarmament, constructive cooperation and good relations is not situation-determined steps, not a tactic aimed at deceiving the opponent. This is the general line of our party and our state.

But there is also a different concept and a different philosophy of Soviet-U.S. relations which we unfortunately happen to hear from your hemisphere. According to the concept, inasmuch as the USSR, as is said back in your country, is a powerful adversary threatening American interests and values, reliance on strength is the only way to peace, and a nuclear rearmament is the condition for a constructive dialogue. In the opinion of the advocates of this concept, and you all know who upholds it, a tough line with regard to the USSR and the heightening of tension ostensibly improve prerequisites for a compromise, and on U.S. terms, of course.

Hence, incorrect practical conclusions are made -- first to deploy American missiles in Europe, to modernize the U.S. strategic forces, to resolve problems of the Middle East and Central America, U.S. way, and then to speak of a possibility of relaxing Soviet-American relations.

There is an acute lack of realism in such discourses, said Vitaly Ruben.

First, there is no sober appraisal of the correlation of forces. Between our countries there is approximate military parity in strategic forces, in medium-range means, in other spheres of military might. The Soviet Union has sufficient possibilities of maintaining the parity, possibilities of preventing it from being broken, possibilities of preventing attainment of superiority over our country.

Second, there is also lack of realistic understanding of the role which the Soviet Union plays in international affairs. Nowadays acute problems in various "hot" points of our planet cannot any longer be resolved without the Soviet Union, in circumvention of its interests.

And, finally, third, the economic situation in our country is absolutely incorrectly assessed. The Soviet Union does not need economic boons from any side. Its line in foreign and home policy cannot be shaken by American sanctions, discrimination, economic warfare methods.

Thus, where may the tough line, the line of confrontation with the Soviet Union lead to? Such a course leads only to aggravations, complications and dangers.

Let us become aware then of the great danger that hangs over the world and realize that it is necessary to comprehensively strive for cooperation only. The destiny of peace, the destiny of mankind depends, in the final account, on that. Let us admit once and for all that no world problems, including the historical controversy between capitalism and socialism, can be resolved through military means. And if this is so, the only way are negotiations, the quest for mutually-acceptable decisions.

Unfortunately, in the dialogue with Washington we have to deal with people, who, judging by their statements and particularly deeds, proceed from the need of heightening confrontation.

A kind of soothing tactics was simultaneously put into play: The version is being insistently spread that some private and even intensive dialogue is allegedly under way between our states and that both countries "are preparing for rapprochement". But this does not accord with reality. Such tactics have only one aim, that of misleading the public who feel concern over the negative course conducted by the opponents of normalization of Soviet-American relations.

The matter is not some our prejudices towards the American administration, but we do not see at all in deed from its side any signs of readiness for improvement of relations.

The tissue of bilateral relations between us was created by decades. Now it was almost fully wrecked. For what sake? This is difficult to understand from the viewpoint of common sense.

"Let there be no mistake: The Soviet Union can do without U.S. goods. We do not ask for anything from you, as we have practically all we need, and what we don't we can get from other countries whose governments approach in a more realistic way of international affairs. As a result it is the American business and your farmers who stand to lose.

"For us a normal development of bilateral relations is something more than a source of commercial, technological or any other direct benefit. It is a symbol of the mutual desire to live in peace. But when there is no desire to develop such relations numerous questions arise as to the real intentions of the other side. And when the case in point is such a nation as the United States, not only doubts but also fears for the future of peace on earth arise.

"This especially true of the U.S. and NATO striving to attain superiority over the USSR in armaments, particularly nuclear armaments. This is what the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles aimed at the Soviet Union -- a plan currently being thrust on Western European countries -- is all about. It is only natural that if new U.S. missiles are sited in Europe, we will take counter measures, too. The military strategic and overall international situation will dramatically change for the worse. An impetus will be given to a new spiral of the arms race.

"It is important that American colleagues come to realise why the deployment of any number of U.S. missiles in Western Europe is unacceptable to us. Such missiles would upset the strategic balance between us. The United States would be able to take aim at targets on our territory from a distance which its missiles will cover in mere five to six minutes. In this case there would be no time for a fore warning. Such missiles are a first-strike weapon. We will never put up with this.

"Soviet leaders have said more than once that the USSR is prepared to reduce the number of its medium-range missiles to the number of missiles which Britain and France have, and at the same time to equalise the number of warheads. In return we are told that we lay claims to nuclear monopoly, that we want to have the same number of missiles all our potential adversaries, taken together, have.

All this sounds somewhat unconvincingly: As if British and French missiles are not the missiles of U.S. allies who openly express the readiness to honor their commitments of allies, as if they, just like U.S. missiles, are not trained on the Soviet Union. If Britain and France remove their missiles, the USSR will likewise remove its medium-range missiles aimed at Europe in what will be a "zero option" between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. What's so bad or illogical about it? However, Britain and France are unwilling to remove their missiles. They do not even agree to include their missiles into the overall balance of missile confronting the USSR. It turns out that they enjoy the rich to have missiles and modernise them, while the Soviet Union has no right to have a counterbalance. This is unfair, and many people in the West have already come to realise that.

At the Geneva negotiations the American side turns down these arguments of ours. The impression is that the U.S. Administration seeks, cost what it may, to start deployment of missiles not later than this year, no matter what are the real possibilities for agreement.

Vitaliy Ruben then said: It is asserted that, influenced by the congress, the president alleviated his stand at the negotiations on strategic weapons. Our experts thoroughly analysed the latest American statements to that effect. We have no doubt that the president has not made a single step towards a compromise, but even more toughened his stand.

A meeting of top party leaders and statesmen of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Treaty member-states was held in Moscow a few days ago -- on June 28. In their joint statement it was reaffirmed once again that we and our allies will by no means allow military superiority over us. The participants in the meeting insistently called upon the NATO member states to weigh in a sober and objective way the alarming tendencies of the international development and to make reasonable conclusions.

The counter-measures of which the Soviet Government warned are not a threat. This is the vital need for our defences. Not to do so means to leave without proper protection the vital centres of our country. But we believe that the best way is not the build-up of armaments, but an accord on a real reduction of military confrontation. This is what the USSR strives for.

It is absurd to assert, said Vitaliy Ruben, that we militarily threaten the United States. As to our conventional armed forces, the United States is out of their range. As to our nuclear forces, as was repeatedly stated by the Soviet leaders, the USSR shall never be the first to attack the United States and shall never be the first to use nuclear weapons against the United States or any other country. We proposed that an agreement to this effect be concluded between the Warsaw Treaty organisation and NATO. It is not clear why the United States does refuse to conclude such an agreement, why it does not undertake the obligation not to be the first to use weapons.

"The United States often refers to the Soviet 'threat' to U.S. interests in various regions of the world as well as to security of U.S. allies in military blocs. These are far-fetched accusations. Just look at the map. You will see for yourselves that it is the United States, and not the Soviet Union, which has more than 300 military bases on foreign territories. It should be noted that an overwhelming majority of them are situated not far from the frontiers of the Soviet Union. It is possible to stage a nuclear attack on the Soviet Union from those bases. In the meantime we have no single base on foreign territory from which it would be possible to deal a nuclear strike at the USA."

Further Vitaliy Ruben spoke of certain dangerous tendencies in U.S. official statements and the military doctrine. "Quite often of late, "he said, "one has had to hear about an outcome of a nuclear war, 'favorable' for the United States, about a possibility of a 'first' strike at control centers in the Soviet Union, about a 'limited' nuclear exchange, etc. Only recently a report by the Scowcroft commission reaffirmed the U.S. intention to be the first to use nuclear weapons in case of a conventional war in Europe."

"Our official political position and our military doctrine are just the opposite of the American ones. The USSR is categorically opposed to any nuclear war, total or limited. The Soviet Union is against the first use of nuclear weapons -- this is inadmissible under any circumstances. We consider any attempt to use nuclear weapons suicidal, not only for a given country, but for mankind as a whole."

"The comparison of these two positions shows where the threat of nuclear war now comes from."

"At present," Vitaliy Ruben said in conclusion, "it is important that efforts be concentrated on what can be called a minimum of measures to lessen tension and prevent war."

First, a nuclear arms freeze. One month ago the Supreme Soviet of the USSR passed a resolution offering all nuclear powers to freeze nuclear arms they possess. Such a freeze would include an end to the quantitative buildup of all components of nuclear arsenals, and a pledge not to deploy nuclear weapons of new classes and types. Besides, a moratorium would be announced on all nuclear weapons tests and on the testing of new classes and types of the delivery vehicles for nuclear weapons.

Second, as a step towards immediate realisation of the freeze idea, it would be necessary to stop realisation of plans of deployment of new nuclear means in Europe, where the threat of nuclear confrontation is now the greatest. The Soviet Union has not been deploying for more than a year now medium-range missiles, aiming at Europe. If the United States renounces deployment of its missiles in Western Europe, it will become possible to considerably reduce the number of Soviet medium-range missiles and then, provided Britain's and France's consent -- to fully liquidate that category of nuclear weapons. It appears that the parliaments of our countries could take a positive stand on this question.

Third, we would believe it important that the parliaments should pass resolutions making it incumbent upon the governments to start without delay negotiations on prohibition of deployment of any weapons in outer space, on exclusion of possible proliferation of the arms race to outer space.

All of us are familiar with the calls for establishing the total anti-missile defense system, for deploying anti-satellite weapons and other programmes of preparations for warfare in outer space, which were announced in the United States. These are dangerous plans. In the course of furthering such programmes there might arise the illusion that one may go off with impunity for a first nuclear strike. And then temptation might arise to make for the launch button.

Fourth, our delegation proposes to take up again the discussion of the idea of renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons. The state of affairs is known. The USSR undertook such an obligation, while the United States refuses to do so. Since the argument is being put forward on the possible beginning of a new total war initially with conventional means, it would expedient to declare for the simultaneous opening of negotiations on mutual renunciation of the use of military force between the Warsaw Treaty organization and NATO, as was proposed by the Warsaw Treaty countries at their Prague meeting in January, when they put forward the idea of concluding the treaty between the Warsaw Treaty organization and NATO.

REAGAN'S 'REARMAMENT' STRATEGY ATTACKED

LD031356 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0849 GMT 3 Jul 83

[Text] Washington, 3 Jul (TASS) -- The Reagan administration's main objectives are an unrestricted buildup of military preparations, whipping up nuclear arms race in order to break the existing rough military parity between the USSR and the United States and ensuring United States' superiority. This was once again confirmed in the President's radio speech on the eve of the U.S. national holiday, Independence Day.

The president has called the massive program for U.S. "rearmament," major elements of which the White House succeeded in pushing through the Congress, his administration's major "achievement". He praised the congressmen who recently rubber-stamped the administration's request, allocating \$625 million to develop and test the new MX first strike strategic missile system, presenting them almost as heroes that should be emulated by others.

At the same time Reagan attacked the opponents of the arms race, accusing them of "unpatriotism" and presenting them as "enemies of genuine democracy." Forced nevertheless to take account of the attitudes of the U.S. public, the overwhelming majority of which is demanding a freeze on nuclear arsenals and effective measures to curb the arms race, Reagan demagogically claimed that his administration is "sincerely interested in genuine arms control" and that the proposals that it had put forward in this connection in Geneva are "fair, flexible and realistic." He also sought to convince his audience that the "prospects for achieving success" at the Geneva talks "had improved" as a result of Congress' approval of the plans for the deployment of MX missiles.

These claims are as hypocritical as they are false. Serious and sober-minded politicians in the United States and experts in the nuclear armaments field are of the unanimous view that by such rhetoric Reagan is merely concealing his line of foiling the Geneva talks. The essence of the American proposals in Geneva boils down to forcing the Soviet Union to disarm unilaterally while the United States continues to build up its military potential: That is how the White House's position in Geneva has been fairly summed up by THE NEW YORK TIMES. At Congressional hearings in recent days four former directors of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, G. Smith, P. Warnke, G. Seignious and E. Rostow, unanimously noted that the American proposals in Geneva are unrealistic by virtue of their one-sidedness and unacceptability to the other side.

The falseness of the White House's master "peace loving" demogogy has been illustrated by THE WASHINGTON POST's report on the fact that the deployment of 100 MX missiles is just the first stage of a three-stage supersecret plan that envisages the deployment of at least 200 of this type of missiles, in addition to new "Midgetman" strategic missiles. As THE LOS ANGELES TIMES reports, referring to confidential Pentagon documents, the White House considers its major tasks during the remaining 18-month period of Reagan's rule to sharply improve the U.S. armed forces' combat readiness and not achieve quick progress in Geneva.

Democratic Senator J. Exon criticized the Reagan administration's course on accelerating military preparations. He stated that the way chosen by the White House will lead to disaster.

SUPREME SOVIET CABLES 4 JUL GREETINGS TO REAGAN

LD031007 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 0952 GMT 3 Jul 83

[Text] To His Excellency Ronald W. Reagan, President of the United States

Esteemed Mr President,

On the occasion of the national holiday of the United States of America -- the day of independence, accept congratulations as well as wishes of peace and well-being to the American people.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

PRC FRIENDSHIP GROUP DELEGATIONS VISIT MOSCOW

3 Jul Arrival

OW031644 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1230 GMT 3 Jul 83

[Text] The delegation of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship With Foreign Countries and the China-USSR Friendship Association arrived in Moscow on 3 July. The delegation was led by Liang Geng, vice president of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries.

Leaders of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural relations with Foreign countries and the USSR-China Friendship Association and Chinese Ambassador to the Soviet Union Yang Shouzheng welcomed the delegation at the airport. The Chinese delegation came to the Soviet Union to establish ties with the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries and the USSR-China Friendship Association and to understand Soviet Life.

4 Jul Activities

OW050105 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 4 Jul 83

[Text] On 4 July members of the delegation of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries and the China-USSR Friendship Association met with Tikhvinskiy, first deputy chairman of the central board of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society. The delegation is headed by Liang Geng, vice president of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries.

At the meeting Tikhvinskiy briefed the members of the Chinese delegation on the activities of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries and the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Association. He hoped that exchanges between the two countries' friendship association would resume and develop.

Liang Geng, head of the Chinese delegation, described the activities of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries and the China-USSR Friendship Association.

The talks proceeded in a candid atmosphere. Also present at the meeting was Zhang Dake, councillor of the Chinese embassy to the USSR.

On the same day the Chinese delegation also visited the Lomonosov University in Moscow and had discussions with Tropin, vice president of the university.

5 Jul Speeches

OW060211 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] Leading members of the Central Board of the Soviet-China Friendship Society Met on 5 July with the members of the delegation of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries and the China-USSR Friendship Association at the House of Friendship of Peoples in Moscow.

The Chinese Delegation is headed by Liang Geng, vice president of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries. It is visiting the USSR at the invitation of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries and the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society. The following is a report of the meeting by the station's reporters.

Present at the meeting were members of the Central Board of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, Soviet experts who had worked in China, Soviet scholars of Chinese studies and activists of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society. (Gao Shikun), counsellor of the Chinese Embassy to the USSR, was also present.

Tikhvinskiy, deputy chairman [title as heard] of the Central Board of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society and academician of the USSR, Academy of Sciences, made a speech welcoming the Chinese guests. He said: On behalf of those present here, allow me, first of all, to welcome our Chinese guests and express satisfaction over the visit to our country by this delegation of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries and the China-USSR Friendship Association, following a long period of suspension of contacts. We believe that during the Chinese delegation's visit in the USSR, its visits to factories, scientific research organs and institutions, and its meetings with the members of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries in Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev and with leading members of the Soviet-China Friendship Society will enable our Chinese guests to obtain a broader impression and better understanding of our country and of the Soviet state's peace-loving policies toward all countries, including the policy meant to restore genuine, friendly relations with the Chinese people.

Comrade Tikhvinskiy then briefed the Chinese guests on the activities of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society. He said: During its 25 years of existence, the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society has done a great deal of work in introducing to the Soviet public the Chinese people's life in all fields, China's long history and rich cultural heritage and the brilliant chapters in the history of Soviet-Chinese relations. The activities carried out by the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society have enhanced the spirit of treating Chinese people with respect and friendship and promoted the work of carrying out internationalist education among the Soviet people. After the termination of contacts with the China-USSR Friendship Association in the mid-1960's -- not as a consequence of any mistake of ours -- the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society did not discontinue its operations. In the light of the resolutions adopted by the 24th, 25th and 26th CPSU Congresses, which demonstrated the USSR's unwavering, Leninist and internationalist policies toward China, the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society has in recent years carried out over 150 projects to mark the most important days in the history of the Chinese people's national liberation and revolutionary struggle and to commemorate prominent activists in China's national liberation movement and revolutionary struggle, world-renowned Chinese men of letters and artists, and the major events in the history of Soviet-Chinese friendship and cooperation. Tikhvinskiy finally said that the USSR is willing to expand the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society's contacts with the China-USSR Friendship Association in various fields.

Liang Geng, head of the Chinese delegation, also made a speech at the meeting. He introduced the China-USSR Friendship Association's activities and expressed the hope that his delegation's visit in the USSR would help to expand the contacts of the two countries' friendship associations.

INDIA'S RAJIV GANDHI ON 10-DAY VISIT TO USSR

Met by Shitikov

LD042253 Moscow TASS in English 1701 GMT 4 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS -- Rajiv Gandhi, member of the Indian Parliament, general secretary of the Indian National Congress (I) Party, arrived in Moscow today. [Delhi Domestic Service in English at 0240 GMT on 5 Jul 83 in a similar report adds: Mr Gandhi is "...on a 10-day visit to the Soviet Union. He was received at the airport by the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, Mr. A. P. Shitikov, and other senior officials."]

Talks With Shitikov

LD052152 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] Comrade Shitikov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the USSR Parliamentary Group, held talks today with Rajiv Gandhi, general secretary of the Indian National Congress Party (I) and member of the Indian parliament, who arrived in Moscow yesterday. The conversation, which passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere, stressed that the struggle of the USSR and India against the threat of war and the arms race, for equal rights and mutually advantageous cooperation among states with different social systems is an important factor in world politics which has a favorable influence on the international situation.

Interviewed in Delhi

PM051510 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with R. Gandhi, general secretary of the Indian National Congress (I) Party National Committee, by unnamed TASS correspondent: "Firm Factor of Stability"]

[Text] Delhi, 4 Jul -- The struggle for peace and detente and against the threat of nuclear war is now of the greatest importance to all mankind, eminent Indian politician and public figure Rajiv Gandhi, general secretary of the National Committee of the ruling Indian National Congress (I) Party, and member of the Indian parliament, said in an interview with a TASS correspondent on the eve of his departure for the USSR. The acceleration of the nuclear arms race in the world is fraught with the danger of a global nuclear catastrophe. India shares the universal anxiety over this threat to peace with other peace-loving countries. The recent nonaligned summit in Delhi paid special attention to questions of the struggle for peace and against thermonuclear war. We are worried by the stoking of international tension and the new threats to peace in various parts of the world. There is also an urgent need now to change the structure of the international economic system, which would accord with the interests of all countries, both developing and developed. We believe that all these problems -- peace, detente, disarmament, and development -- are inextricably and organically interconnected.

India has frequently stressed, R. Gandhi continued, that it is essential, come what may, to strengthen peace and detente, eliminate the very threat of war, and take specific steps toward universal and total disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament, under effective international control. We support all constructive proposals in this direction. India welcomed the Soviet Union's statement that it will not be the first to use nuclear weapons as an important step in the direction of total prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons or the threat of their use. We are grateful to the Soviet Union for supporting the Indian proposal to conduct talks to adopt an international convention on the nonuse of nuclear weapons and the resolution submitted at the UN General Assembly by India and other countries on "freezing nuclear weapons." We express the hope that the great powers will display persistence in holding disarmament talks.

India believes, R. Ghandhi continued, that international problems must be resolved through peace talks and not with the aid of threats or the use of force. Here the limitation of the arms race should be conducted by simultaneous, joint efforts in order to prevent the disruption of parity. India and the nonaligned countries support any steps promoting the consolidation of trust between states and the elimination of the danger of war.

Rajiv Gandhi rated highly the relations of friendship and mutually advantageous cooperation which have been established between India and the Soviet Union. Indian-Soviet relations, he said, are characterized by equality, mutual respect, and understanding. Our friendship is based on trust and good will on both sides. Mutually advantageous cooperation between our countries is expanding steadily in various fields. Indian-Soviet friendship is strengthened by meetings between the leaders of the two countries at summit level and the continuing exchange of opinions on the main issues of international politics. It is no accident, therefore, that relations between the USSR and India are rightly considered to be an excellent example of peaceful coexistence and fruitful cooperation between two different political, economic and social systems. Both our countries are continuing to strengthen these relations. The friendship between India and the Soviet Union has become a firm factor of peace and stability throughout the world.

USSR-DRA ECONOMIC COMMISSION AGREEMENTS CITED

LD052057 Moscow TASS in English 1659 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS -- The Soviet Union has rendered, and will render, necessary assistance to the fraternal people of Afghanistan, Zia Nuriyev, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, stated here today. He headed a Soviet delegation at two-day talks which were held in Moscow within the framework of the third session of the permanent intergovernmental Soviet-Afghan Commission for Economic Cooperation.

The Soviet Government's decisions to provide various consumer goods for Afghanistan free of charge, to reschedule payments on the previous Soviet credits, to supply seeds and fertilizers free of charge, and to extend for two years the work of Soviet economic and technical advisers have found reflection in the documents signed today.

The commission pointed out the successful work of Soviet and Afghan organizations to implement the earlier concluded agreements on economic and technical cooperation. Understandings on matters aimed at further developing cooperation in the field of transport, the power industry, agriculture, irrigation, geological prospecting and the training of national cadres were considered and reached during the commission's work.

The progress of fulfillment of mutual obligations arising from the trade agreement for 1981-85 and the trade protocol for 1983 was discussed as well.

The members of the Afghan delegation led by Khalil Abawi, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, chairman of the State Planning Committee, met with the leadership of the USSR State Planning Committee, the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, the Ministry of Foreign Trade, and other Soviet ministries and departments. Concrete matters of economic and technical cooperation and expansion of trade were discussed and practical measures on many matters of mutual interest were coordinated.

Before returning home, the Afghan delegation is to visit Leningrad and Dushanbe.

KOHL, GENSCHER AT MOSCOW DINNER; TALKS COUNTINUE

Tikhonov Dinner Speech

PM051609 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report on speech by Nikolay Tikhonov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at the 4 July dinner given in honor of FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl and vice-chancellor, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the FRG Hans-Dietrich Genscher]

[Text] We welcome your visit, Mr. Chancellor N.A. Tikhonov said. It gives us an opportunity to carry on the political dialogue.

Since the time of the signing of the historic Moscow Treaty, much has been done for strengthening confidence between our peoples and for developing mutually beneficial economic, scientific-technical, cultural, and other relations. Agreements have been concluded whose term will extend beyond limits of this century. The USSR and the FRG have more than once cooperated in the international arena in the interests of strengthening peace and international cooperation.

In a way, in spite of the unpassing bitterness of the past, I am speaking about the Second World War. We have succeeded in accumulating the experience of a positive development of relations. It appears that it is important not only to preserve, but also to multiply it.

The Soviet Union's attitude to the Federal Republic of Germany, to its people and government is determined by the wish to develop all-round cooperation. It goes without saying that we reckon with the fact that the FRG is a loyal participant in the North Atlantic bloc. It is not our intention to drive a wedge between the FRG's and the United States or the FRG's other allies. We are divided by world outlooks, but we are against ideological differences leading to irreconcilability in interstate relations. We consider it important to look for ways toward accord between countries belonging to different social systems. This, if you wish, is imperative for this nuclear age.

We are convinced that not a single European state can be indifferent to the destinies of our continent. And in this regard the Europeans have much to talk about with each other. We do not wish countries to be opponents, but to be partners not only on issues of the economy or culture, but also on security.

We have started talks today. It can be said already now that they are of a substantial character and confirm the possibility of developing mutually beneficial relations in various fields.

I also believe the discussion concerning international issues to be useful, though we have different views on a number of them, which include major ones. I hope that you, Mr. Federal Chancellor, will have no grievance against me, if I expound our views in a little greater detail.

The international situation has become very alarming. This is recognized by all. A source of special concern is the fact that the proponents of the positions of strength policy are preparing to turn Europe into an area of maximum military and political tensions.

While the Soviet Union is doing everything in its power at the Geneva talks to reach a just and mutually acceptable agreement on a reduction of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, and has more than once made big strides to meet the opposite side, the USA is only creating a semblance of its participation in the talks. It is putting forward deliberately unacceptable demands for a unilateral disarmament of the USSR, while preparing for the deployment of new American missiles in the FRG and a number of other West European countries.

But the implementation of that plan will inevitably result in a sharp deterioration of the situation in Europe and all over the world. This must be clearly realised.

The rough balance of the military forces of the West and East in Europe, on whose basis peace on the continent has been maintained (and not badly maintained) for many years and good-neighborly relations between the European nations were developing, would be sharply upset. The danger is all the more obvious when the point at issue is the deployment of American first-strike weapons under the conditions being advocated in Washington where the idea of a "limited" nuclear war -- limited, to all appearances, to Europe -- is considered possible, and almost, legitimate.

Lastly, it would mean that for the first time in post-war history a military threat again stems from the German soil to the Soviet people. There is not need to say what that would mean to us.

Naturally, we will not respond to this with concessions at the Geneva talks, as certain figures in the West sometimes claim. We and our allies will respond by taking without delay additional measures to strengthen our security and develop a counterbalance to NATO's new military potential. The balance will be restored as a result, but at a higher level, which will be more dangerous for continued peace. And responsibility for this will fall upon the authors and executors of NATO's present-day plans.

Is not it better to reach agreement on reducing the nuclear arsenals of both sides instead of boosting them? There still is a possibility for such an agreement in Geneva and we call for making use of it before it is too late. We stand for the complete equality of the two military-political alliances in Europe on missiles, on planes, and on warheads, and at the lowest possible level. If we proceed from this, I think agreement is quite possible. So we call upon the NATO countries, including, of course, the Federal Republic of Germany, to help prevent the possibility of such an agreement from being missed.

The Warsaw Treaty countries have put forward quite a few concrete proposals leading to detente. Just recently the Moscow statement reiterated our common readiness to begin practical discussions on the idea of a treaty on the mutual non-use of force and maintenance of relations of peace between the participants in both groups. But NATO has been keeping silent for half a year now, although such a treaty would not hurt anyone but would create dependable peace in Europe and in the world at large.

When there is political will and when respect is shown for each other's legitimate interests, it is possible to work for agreements. The latest evidence of this is the good news from Madrid, where prospects for an auspicious and early completion of the meeting are beginning to take shape. I would like to believe that the example of Madrid will give a stimulus to Vienna. What I mean is the talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, where the latest proposals of the socialist countries make it possible to put an end to fruitless discussions and to work out a mutually acceptable decision.

Europe was the cradle of detente. The destinies of the beneficial process initiated in Helsinki eight years ago depend on all the European states, big, medium-sized and small alike.

We believe that further progress on this path would be beneficial to the Europeans and to mankind as a whole."

In conclusion Nikolay Tikhonov raised a toast to the health of the federal chancellor and Mrs. Kohl, to the health of the vice-chancellor and federal minister of foreign affairs, to the health of all the guests from the FRG, and to good cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany in the interests of European and world peace!

A speech in reply was made by Helmut Kohl.

The speeches were heard with attention and greeted with applause. The dinner took place in a friendly atmosphere.

Kohl Dinner Speech

PM052032 Moscow PRAVDA Russian 6 Jul 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report on speech by FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl at Great Kremlin Palace dinner on 4 July]

[Text] On my own behalf, and at the same time on behalf of my delegation, I thank you, esteemed Mr Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, for the greetings and the hospitality given to us in Moscow, H. Kohl said.

I am filled with a sense of satisfaction at the fact that I am able to continue with you the dialogue whose tradition was established by Konrad Adenauer during his visit to Moscow in September 1955.

The Federal Government that I head was confirmed on 6 March 1983 by the convincing vote of the electors. The important aims of my foreign policy program are as follows:

- The further development of long-term relations with the Soviet Union and our other Eastern neighbors.
- the qualitative renewal and improvement of our relations.
- The holding of more regular [capitalized words printed in boldface] talks and contacts at all levels including at the very highest level.

My visit serves to enable two new political leaders to become acquainted with one another and to explain their positions to one another. It presents an opportunity to strengthen mutual understanding and confidence between our two states and between East and West in general.

Our states belong to different political and social systems. The FRG belongs to the Atlantic Alliance and is a European Community member; it is linked by friendly ties to the United States and its European partners. Our commitment [prinadlezhnost] to the West which is firmly based on a commonality of convictions is a reality and a requirement of our security and is also an element of the predictability of our actions and an element of our truthfulness. It is the basis of our readiness for dialogue and of our striving for mutual understanding with the Governments of the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact members as well as with their citizens.

In view of the volume of tasks requiring solution, people in the FRG and the Soviet Union, despite their divergence of political opinions and membership in opposing social systems, have a common point of departure: namely, a concern to ensure peace and to overcome tension and its causes.

Relations between our countries are of particularly important significance to us since we are in the center of Europe both geographically and politically. They are inseparable from the general conditions of East-West relations as a whole.

There have long been close personal ties and multifarious forms of cooperation between Germans and Russians. Russia's influence on German and European culture, particularly in the 19th century, is still felt today.

The events of our century and the sufferings and grave sacrifices of two world wars shook relations between our two countries. But they did not destroy the historic ties between us: What is more, the sufferings endured have given rise to joint obligations.

We have learned history's lesson. Our people are filled with a burning desire to live in peace. We know that peace in Europe and throughout the world can only be strengthened jointly.

In view of the difficult international situation we need compromises which can stand the test and we need to see the long-term prospects for cooperation between ourselves without limiting our gaze just to the serious difficulties that exist at present.

That is why we want to pursue a policy of mutual understanding, cooperation, detente, and a balancing of interests with the East on the basis of the treaties with the Soviet Union, Poland, and the CSSR by filling them with concrete life, on the basis of the quadripartite agreement, the treaty on the fundamental principles of relations with the GDR, the Helsinki Final Act, and also on the basis of understandings and statements based on those documents. Diverse opportunities exist for intensifying cooperation in the political, economic, and cultural spheres.

We want to pursue a realistic policy. Its nucleus is the principle of the nonuse of force. The policy is guided in mutual relations by the spirit of good-neighborliness while striving to make constructive use of the agreed *modus vivendi* and to impart real life to the *modus vivendi*.

Mr Chairman, H. Kohl continued, our meeting is taking place against the global background of a difficult international situation. Conflicts, tension, the ambitions of powers [derzhavy] and disregard for the universal commandments of restraint are jeopardizing peace and stability in many parts of the world.

In some important fields we differ in our opinions in determining the cause of conflicts and the ways to resolve them.

H. Kohl then stated his interpretation of the situation in Afghanistan, in Indochina, in the Near East, and in Africa.

The FRG, H. Kohl said, respects and supports the independence and the status of true nonalignment of the Third World states. These states must not be drawn into antagonism between East and West.

The recently concluded Belgrade UNCTAD session clearly brought to light the grave economic problems of Third World countries. All industrial countries of West and East are called upon to open their markets more widely and engage in more intensive financial and technical cooperation with the developing countries. This, Mr Chairman, is a suitable arena for peaceful competition between all countries and systems.

Not only we, but also all our allies, desire a substantial improvement in East-West relations.

An important medium in this connection is the East-West dialogue being effected today by the FRG and the Soviet Union. I am in favor of a summit meeting soon between your general secretary and the U.S. President. We consider that such a meeting, if it is well prepared, will be able to substantially reduce mistrust and stimulate for the solution of urgent problems.

The latest NATO communique, in parallel with expressing the alliance's determination for defense, stresses the readiness "to develop by way of cooperation and dialogue constructive relations between East and West for the purpose of attaining true detente." This proposal is supported by all members of the alliance.

The process of strengthening peace, which began in Helsinki, a process for the benefit of people all over Europe, serves to eliminate misunderstandings, mistrust and tension. We must continue the process with determination and persistence.

The speedy and successful conclusion of the Madrid meeting of CSCE participant states with the signing of a meaningful and balanced final document, which must include a mandate to convene a conference on confidence-building measures and on disarmament in Europe, would be a step pointing the way to the future. The compromise draft final document, submitted in Madrid, safeguards the interests of all participants. We must quickly achieve a satisfactory result on the basis provided by the draft.

He expressed his viewpoint as regards Poland.

The questions of security and disarmament, the chancellor went on, are especially important for the FRG, which is at the junction between two alliances and two social systems.

For us the principle of nonuse of force remains the core of our policy for strengthening peace. It is enshrined in the UN Charter and has been confirmed in the Helsinki Final Act. It is the pivotal element of our treaties with our neighbors in the East. The heads of state and government of Atlantic alliance members have solemnly declared in their June 1982 Bonn declaration that none of their weapons will ever be used, unless it is to repulse aggression. It is impossible to formulate the principle of nonuse of force more simply. This declaration, as H. Kohl claimed, has a much broader scope than the renunciation of first use of nuclear weapons.

We took note with interest of the proposal contained in the Prague declaration, to which the Warsaw pact member-states referred again at the Moscow summit meeting. A new confirmation, in a binding form, of the ban on the use of force could help improve the international situation if it should lead to a specific prevention of the threat of force and, where force is being used, to its cessation.

We understand the historically determined interests of the Soviet Union's security. In our turn, we expect that our security requirements be treated with understanding.

The situation is particularly serious with regard to land-based medium-range nuclear weapons. The joint declaration of the FRG and the USSR of 6 May 1978 contains the unequivocal statement that "both sides consider it important that no one strive for military superiority." At the same time both sides proceeded from the premise that approximate equality and parity are sufficient to ensure defense. Already in 1978, so H. Kohl maintained, the Soviet Union had great superiority in the sphere of land-based medium-range missile weapons, and since the joint declaration was signed it has also doubled the number of its nuclear warheads on these missiles.

On 3 May 1983 General Secretary Yu.V. Andropov called the number of nuclear warheads the decisive criterion of a nuclear threat. The chancellor expounded the well-known NATO stand on medium-range missile weapons in Europe.

We do not share the viewpoint, H. Kohl went on to say, that the Geneva talks have so far been totally fruitless. Important questions have essentially received a clear definition. Given the appropriate political decisions and the necessary readiness to compromise, it would be possible to secure results at these talks even this year.

I am particularly pleased that in their declaration adopted at the 29 June summit meeting the Warsaw Pact states evaluate the situation in the same way and voice readiness to secure results even this year. I hope that this statement by the Warsaw Pact states in favor of disarmament and arms control will also affect other talk forums in Geneva.

We are for both parts of the two-track NATO decision, H. Kohl continued. We advocate exhausting all possibilities for talks. We want to work toward ensuring peace amid fewer and fewer quantities of weapons.

I appeal to the Soviet Union to open up the possibility of achieving a balanced result at the talks. I share the Soviet Government's opinion that it is still not too late for this.

But I wish to declare here with equal clarity that if it still proves impossible to achieve a concrete result at the talks this year, then -- as was envisaged -- deployment will begin in accordance with the pledges adopted within the framework of the alliance. The Federal Government, backed by the support of the majority of the German people, will not back down from this. But even then the alliance will be prepared to continue the talks.

I am sure that our meetings can be useful.

What was stated in the Warsaw Pact states' 29 June [as published] declaration concerning the talks on medium-range nuclear means inspires me with hope of success.

The Federal Government which I head also wants substantial progress to be made at the Geneva talks on strategic weapons, and here we essentially perceive a close link with the talks on medium-range weapons.

We are equally interested in the quick success of the Vienna talks on the mutual balanced reduction of armed forces in Europe and the Geneva talks on a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons.

We received with interest the news the other day that the Soviet Union had submitted at the Vienna talks a draft treaty which, together with the draft submitted by the West in July 1982, can serve as a basis for further rapprochement on as yet unresolved fundamental questions.

Disarmament in the sphere of nuclear arms should not distract our attention from the need to limit conventional arms. Therefore we want to achieve greater stability and greater security by reducing armed forces in Central Europe within the framework of the Vienna talks and by achieving throughout Europe a greater degree of "transparency" of actions of a military character which we are seeking within the framework of a conference on confidence-building measures and disarmament in Europe.

A great opportunity now presents itself at the talks for creating a basis for long-term detente and cooperation between West and East, resting on the principles of equality and equal rights.

The Federal Government advocates this most imperatively.

Just as imperatively we declare that disputes and differences of opinion in the security sphere should not envelop or even overshadow our cooperation in other spheres.

Mr Chairman, reliable political prospects for the future would increase the chances of exploiting the emerging potential for long-term economic cooperation. I am deeply convinced that there is wide scope here for developing our relations.

We can regard with satisfaction the gratifying development of economic relations between our two states which are reflected in the constant growth of the already high level of trade between us. In the last 10 years this trade has increased eight times over.

The FRG will remain committed to long-term cooperation with your country, as laid down in the existing agreements which extend into the next century. We want to develop these agreements further.

The benefit of active economic cooperation oriented toward the future and in keeping with mutual interests is not confined to improving well-being. We also regard cooperation as an important and lasting basis for stable and fruitful long-term political relations.

The Federal Government demonstrated this in May by its willingness to extend the two agreements on cooperation concluded in 1973 and 1974 for 10 years.

Mr Chairman, relations between our two countries and peoples have their roots in remote history and in human feelings. People traveled from all parts of Germany to Russia, contributing to its spiritual and economic development.

The chancellor touched on the question of Soviet citizens of German nationality leaving the USSR.

In conclusion H. Kohl said: Let us also bank on progress when it comes to exchanges in the sphere of art, science, and sport; and exchanges involving young people, trade unions and other social groups. Personal acquaintance between people is the best way of finding mutual understanding, and mutual understanding is the surest guarantee of peace. It was with this in mind, Mr Chairman, that during our first meeting I suggested to you that political dialogue at summit level and at all other levels which have proven themselves in practice should be made an integral part of our relations. I would be happy, therefore, if we could continue our dialogue with General Secretary Yu.V. Andropov and yourself in the FRG. We have talked perfectly frankly with one another and listened hard to one another. That is why I came here and if only for that reason this meeting between us has been very useful.

I would like to express the wish that this opportunity for mutual understanding may facilitate our work in the future and that it may become a lasting foundation of trust.

He proposed a toast to peace and mutual understanding between the peoples, to a happy future, and to successes in the further development of the Soviet land, to the health of CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Yu.V. Andropov, to the health of the USSR Council of Ministers Chairman N.A. Tikhonov, and to the health of all Soviet citizens.

First Andropov-Kohl Talks

LD051114 Moscow TASS in English 1056 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS - Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has met Helmut Kohl, federal chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, at the Kremlin on July 5.

Yuriy Andropov and Helmut Kohl expressed their mutual satisfaction with the possibility to make each other's personal acquaintance and frankly to exchange opinion on a number of fundamental questions of Soviet-West German relations and the international situation, particularly in Europe.

Yuriy Andropov welcomed the arrival of Chancellor Helmut Kohl and Vice-Chancellor Hans-Dietrich Genscher in the USSR. The Soviet Union, he stressed, attaches prime importance to relations with West Germany.

The Soviet Union and West Germany have travelled a significant and fruitful path in developing good relations between them since the Moscow Treaty was concluded in 1970. The Soviet leadership stands for these relations continuing to develop in the positive direction, thus meeting the interests of the peoples of both countries, the interests of Europe as a whole, and promoting the cause of world peace.

In this connection, Yuriy Andropov said, particular importance is being attached to the question of preventing another round of the nuclear arms race in Europe, which is fraught with unpredictable consequences. What is meant here is the attempt of the NATO alliance drastically to change the strategic situation in Europe to the prejudice of the vital interests of the USSR and its allies. It is planned to turn West German territory into a launching site for American first-strike nuclear missiles aimed at the Soviet Union and its allies. This would actually mean the revival of the threat of a war against the USSR being unleashed from German soil.

The Soviet Union entered talks with the United States on nuclear weapons in Europe with the sincere desire to achieve positive results. We are trying to have the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe drastically lowered with the strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security. The USSR is doing everything possible to reckon with the considerations of its partners in the talks and to reach a mutually acceptable agreement taking account of the interests of both sides. Meanwhile, the U.S. position boils down to the demand for the unilateral disarmament of the Soviet Union with the preservation of the NATO countries' medium-range nuclear arms arsenals intact. We cannot disregard, in particular, the considerable quantities of the British and French nuclear weapons of this claim which are aimed at us.

The United States would like to get a monopoly by deploying next to the USSR nuclear weapons capable of hitting targets deep in our territory whereas the USSR does not have and, of course, according to the American logic, should not have a comparable potential somewhere near the USA.

Politicians in the NATO countries keep repeating that the USSR will make concessions in Geneva after new American missiles have been brought to Western Europe. This is a profound and dangerous delusion. If it comes to deployment, we will neither surrender our positions nor weaken our defences but take prompt and effective measures in response to ensure the security of the USSR and its allies.

The Soviet Union finds it hard to understand, Yuriy Andropov said, what West Germany hopes to gain from the deployment of American missiles, from our measures in response, from the oversaturation of Central Europe with all types of weapons of mass destruction.

With the present state of affairs the Soviet medium-range missiles in the European zone are merely a counterbalance to the medium-range nuclear systems of the NATO countries in that zone. They are not aimed against the West German Armed Forces. But if American missiles are deployed on West German soil, the situation will change. The military threat for West Germany will grow manifold. Relations between our two countries will be bound to suffer certain complications as well. As for the Germans in the FRG and the GDR, they would have, as someone recently put it, to look at one another through thick palisades of missiles.

Is not it better to use the possibility, while it is still available, to reach a truly honest agreement, taking account of the legitimate interests of both sides, in order considerably to reduce medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe instead of building them up and thus greatly improve the situation in our continent and in the world at large? Agreement is still possible while deployments have not been initiated.

Attention was paid in the Soviet Union to Chancellor Kohl's statement that the West German Government regarded with understanding the Soviet Union's security needs, caused by historical reasons. It would be very good both for our two countries and for the cause of European Peace if these words are reflected in West Germany's practical policy.

Yuriy Andropov said that the Soviet side saw a way to mutual understanding in complete frankness accompanied by goodwill and readiness to cooperate for peace and goodneighborliness.

Chancellor Helmut Kohl appreciated the sincere atmosphere of the conversation and stressed the desire of the West German Government led by him to maintain relations of peace and goodneighborliness with the Soviet Union and to continue to develop constructively relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union.

At the same time he stated the well-known position of the leading circles of the NATO alliance on the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in a number of West European countries, first and foremost in West Germany.

Yuriy Andropov and Helmut Kohl were unanimous that, despite differences between the positions of the sides on a number of major issues, the sincere exchange of opinion was useful. They agreed to continue to maintain contacts with each other.

DPA on Talks, Itinerary

LD050939 Hamburg DPA in German 0910 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow 5 Jul (DPA) -- Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl spoke for the first time this morning in the Kremlin with Soviet state and party leader Yuriy Andropov. It was learned from sources within the German delegation that Andropov (69) gave the impression of being "intellectually alert" when welcoming [Kohl] to the private discussion. "Difficulties in moving" were apparent, however, in his walk and in his left hand, it was stated.

Andropov expressed regret that he had not been able to participate in the delegations' talks and the state banquet on Monday. Unfortunately, "it was not possible," said Andropov. The German side is meanwhile further convinced that the unexpected cancellation yesterday was due to health reasons.

At the same time as Kohl and Andropov, foreign ministers Hans-Dietrich Genscher and Andrey Gromyko also met in the Kremlin for separate discussions. In the afternoon, Andropov, Kohl, Gromyko, and Genscher are to meet for a joint discussion.

Government spokesman Peter Boenisch told German journalists with regard to Monday's talks between delegations and with regard to the toasts, that despite all difficulties on the question of medium-range missiles in Europe, both sides still believed agreement at the Geneva talks to be possible. The Soviet side, moreover, used a "new formula" for relations between Bonn and Moscow which was acceptable and which envisaged an expansion of relations without detriment to their respective friendly states.

PRAVDA was the only Soviet paper on Tuesday to print Kohl's toast, omitting controversial passages. The paper omitted, for example, Kohl's statements on German unity entirely and parts of what he said on medium-range weapons. It also omitted what Kohl said on Afghanistan, Poland, and the desire of Russian Germans to emigrate.

Second Andropov-Kohl Talks

LD051427 Moscow TASS in English 1412 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS -- Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and Helmut Kohl, federal chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany met for a concluding conversation in the Kremlin in the second half of the day today. Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, and Hans-Dietrich Genscher, vice-chancellor, minister of foreign affairs of the FRG, took part in the conversation.

The sides continued an exchange of views on fundamental issues of Soviet-West German relations with a view to their possible further development on the basis of the Moscow Treaty in the interests of the peoples of both countries and in the interests of European and international security.

Yuriy Andropov pointed out that the USSR and the FRG, relying on the Moscow Treaty, have been on the whole managing in the course of the previous years to find a common language and to find suitable-to-both-sides unravelment of arising problems. This experience is our joint asset. It is important that it be not wasted in the present-day situation which has become complicated.

Assurances were reiterated from the West German side that the present Government of the FRG stands for the development of relations between the USSR and the FRG on the basis of the Moscow Treaty and subsequent agreements signed by the two countries.

A number of concrete aspects of possible further development of bilateral cooperation between the USSR and the FRG were considered as well. The sides agreed to continue talks on some matters which already were the subject of an exchange of views between them earlier.

The sides touched upon a series of other issues, including the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe.

Noting a frank and business-like character of the conversation, the sides agreed that issues discussed during Soviet-West German talks in Moscow would be a subject of further exchange of opinions between the sides.

Andrey Aleksandrov, assistant to general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Vladimir Semenov, ambassador of the USSR to the FRG; Andreas Meyer-Landrut, ambassador of the FRG to the USSR; and Horst Tellschick, head of the Foreign Policy Department of the Office of the Federal Chancellor of the FRG; were present during the conversation.

Talks 'Satisfactory' Despite Differences

LD051251 Hamburg DPA in German 1156 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Excerpt] Moscow, 5 Jul [DPA] In the afternoon of July 5, Kohl and Andropov met again for another discussion at which both foreign ministers, Hans-Dietrich Genscher and Andrey Gromyko were present. According to Government spokesman Boenisch, the discussion of the security issue had, however, been wound up in the preceding meeting between Kohl and Andropov.

Genscher and Gromyko also discussed the reduction of medium-range weapons in Europe during their meeting this morning. According to the foreign office spokesman, Karl-Theodor Paschke, Genscher used the occasion to reject Soviet criticism of the way the Americans are conducting negotiations in Geneva. Such an accusation must also include the Federal Government which has worked for a flexible attitude on the part of the West. Both in the discussion with Andropov [as received] as well as in that with Genscher, the Soviet side attached great importance to the inclusion of British and French medium-range potentials. Genscher made the accusation that this Soviet demand is blocking the Geneva talks.

Asked whether the points of view moved any closer on any point, Boenisch said that it is too early to say anything in this respect since they are still in the middle of the talks. In particular, bilateral problems as well as economic cooperation still have to be discussed.

In his meeting with journalists, Boenisch said that perhaps the meeting between Kohl and Andropov would help make progress after all in the disarmament question. No one expects the Bonn delegation, like gold-diggers, to bring treasure home with them. Other government circles conceded that there was no noticeable movement on the missile question.

Boenisch said that the Soviet side had expressed a uniform point of view in all the discussions on the question of medium-range weapons. He was thus alluding to the speech by Premier Nikolay Tikhonov the previous evening whose remarks had not differed from those by Andropov. On the whole, Boenisch described the German-Soviet talks at this point as "a satisfactory result for us" if one considers existing relations. The visit had primarily been concerned with getting acquainted and holding a frank exchange of views.

The chancellor underlined Bonn's interest in long-term good relations with Moscow. He emphasized the renunciation of force and stated that the Federal Republic was not hungary for missiles. No war would emanate from German soil. "We are not suicidal." There is not only nuclear but also conventional overarming.

Andropov accepted Kohl's invitation for him to visit the Federal Republic. A date would have to be agreed on, however. According to Boenisch, Kohl gained the impression that Andropov, who is said to be ill, is obviously somewhat restricted in his movements. Mentally, however he was very alert and reacted very quickly and had the talks well in hand at all times. Kohl also repeated his desire for a summit between Reagan and Andropov and gained the impression that his Soviet host is in favor of such a meeting.

In addition to the missile topic, Genscher and Gromyko also discussed the state of the CSCE follow-up conference and German-Soviet relations. The climate of the talks was good, without harshness and calm in a businesslike fashion, said Genscher's spokesman Paschke. Genscher repeated the proposal that the final document should be signed by the foreign ministers of the countries participating in Madrid. Gromyko responded positively to this. Both foreign ministers stressed their interest in an early start to a conference on disarmament in Europe. In Genscher's view this could have a good effect on overall East-West relations.

The Federal foreign minister also rejected in his talks with Gromyko the accusation that there are revanchist tendencies in the Federal Republic. The Bonn delegation reacted in a similar manner yesterday to remarks by Tikhonov to this effect. Gromyko explained the drop in the numbers of emigrants as being due "to natural reasons." In view of Genscher's concern at this development, he had however promised to examine [the question] benevolently.

Third Tikhonov Meeting Held

LD051545 Moscow TASS in English 1516 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS -- Nikolay Tikhonov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, and Hans-Dietrich Genscher, vice-chancellor of the FRG, minister of foreign affairs of the FRG, had a conversation in the Kremlin today. [sentence as received]

Nikolay Tikhonov and Helmut Kohl exchanged views on bilateral relations, making special emphasis on the economic aspects of those relations. It was noted with satisfaction that trade and economic contacts, resting on a sound legal foundation, were developing in a stable manner, and for the benefit of the USSR and the FRG.

The sides expressed the conviction that there were conditions for the further development of economic cooperation. The sides reached mutual understanding on the issue that the forthcoming session of the USSR and FRG commission on economic and scientific-technical cooperation to be held next autumn should review a number of specific cooperation projects in the realisation of which large, medium and small-scale West German firms could take part.

It was stressed that only in conditions of peace and stronger trust between countries it was possible to develop cooperation in all fields, including in the field of trade and economic contacts. The expansion of such contacts at the same time was a major factor of stability and goodneighborliness in Europe.

Ustinov Receives Kohl, Genscher

LD051632 Moscow TASS in English 1628 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS -- Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Defense Minister of the USSR Marshal Dmitriy Ustinov today had a meeting with Federal Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany Helmut Kohl and deputy federal chancellor, Foreign Minister of the FRG Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

Questions of mutual interest were discussed during the talk which passed in a businesslike atmosphere.

Taking part in the talk, from the Soviet side, were chief of General Staff of the Armed Forces, First Deputy Defense Minister of the USSR Marshal Nikolay Ogarkov, and First Chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the USSR Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev.

From the FRG's side -- the FRG Ambassador in the USSR Andreas Meyer-Landrut, Chief of the Foreign-Policy Division of the Federal Chancellor's Department Horst Telchik, Special Representative of the Federal Government on questions of disarmament Friedrich Rutt.

Kohl Assessment of Talks

LDO51712 Hamburg DPA in German 1645 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow, 5 Jul (DPA) -- Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl has received no indications in Moscow that could point to a breakthrough at the Geneva negotiations on medium-range weapons in Europe. In a first assessment of his talks, the chancellor said that he has heard "interesting details" on this subject.

At a reception at the German ambassador's residence this evening, Kohl expressly stated that he does not want to be understood as suggesting that these details could bring about a breakthrough.

Kohl, who met Andropov twice today, found the fact that they had got to know one another personally and also their often mutually conflicting points of view was in itself important for both sides. Following the talks with Andropov the chancellor had another talk this afternoon with Premier Nikolay Tikhonov about prospects for economic cooperation, and with Defense Minister Dmitriy Ustinov and Chief of Staff Nikolay Ogarkov on the subject of missiles.

Kohl said that he had made a strong plea to Andropov for a summit meeting with President Reagan and had gained the impression that he was in favor of such a meeting. The chancellor told members of the German colony that he hoped that something would happen in the foreseeable future.

During the talks in Moscow a list of so-called hardship cases of Soviet citizens of German ethnic origin who wanted to go to the Federal Republic to be reunited with their families was handed over.

Kohl Press Conference

LDO61233 Moscow TASS in English 1210 GMT 6 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS -- Speaking at a press conference here today the Federal Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, Helmut Kohl, expressed satisfaction with the hospitality accorded to him and the West German delegation in the Soviet Union. Our talks with the Soviet leaders, the chancellor stressed, were very frank and straightforward and the subjects discussed wide-ranging.

I think that these talks were constructive and helped clarify the positions of the two sides. It is necessary to continue such contacts, he said.

The chancellor said that he had invited Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to continue the exchange of opinions in Bonn.

Both of us, Helmut Kohl said, proceeded from the belief that it is useful to get acquainted with the positions of the sides, especially at a moment when East-West relations are strained.

The main topics of talks, Helmut Kohl said, were the tense situation in the world, its disconcerting effects on the situation in Europe, questions of security and arms limitation, and questions of bilateral relations.

The West German chancellor repeated at a press conference the well known views of his government concerning medium-range missiles.

He tried to justify the unconstructive position of the USA which is actually blocking agreement at the Geneva talks. He objected specifically to the medium-range nuclear means of Britain and France -- which are known to be aimed at Warsaw Treaty countries -- being taken into account into account.

Turning to the Madrid meeting H. Kohl said: "We were of the same opinion that the talks in Madrid should be concluded as soon as possible."

Replying to a question, Helmut Kohl tried to deny facts concerning the increased activity of revanchist elements in West Germany and to present the activities of the revanchist "associations" existing in the FRG as a "manifestation of patriotism."

Speaking of relations between the USSR and the FRG, the chancellor said that the two sides expressed willingness to continue bilateral cooperation on a long-term basis in accordance with the agreements concluded and the statements made earlier. The two sides pointed out that opportunities for bilateral cooperation in different fields, including economy, science, culture, environmental protection, are far from being used fully. It was agreed to continue talks on these questions through routine channels.

Meetings 'Satisfactory', 'Open'

LD060908 Hamburg DPA in German 0814 GMT 6 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow, 6 Jul (DPA) -- Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl expressed "satisfaction" with his Moscow talks on Wednesday in the Soviet capital. At a press conference before continuing his journey to Kiev, Kohl said that the talks had had a "stabilizing" effect on relations between the Soviet Union and the FRG.

Kohl repeated that he had stated in Moscow that U.S. medium-range missiles would be stationed if there were no concrete results at the Geneva negotiations. However he had also said that there was still sufficient time before the end of the year for a solution.

The Soviet side also had made clear that they considered a solution still possible, Kohl said. He had appealed to them not to block the negotiations in Geneva by insisting that the French and British nuclear weapons also be taken into account.

[Passage indistinct] The announcement of Soviet steps in response to the stationing of U.S. medium-range missiles had not been given much room in his Moscow talks. Responding to a journalist's question about the transfer of nuclear weapons to Eastern European countries as indicated by the Soviets, Kohl said: "I suggest answering that question when those countries are in possession of these means".

In answer to questions from Eastern journalists, Kohl defended the exiles' organizations in the FRG against the accusation of "revanchism." The chancellor pointed out that these organizations had been "the first" in 1950 to incorporate the principle of nonviolence.

Kohl described his talks in Moscow as open. On the subject of missiles, it had been the case of "persuasion" from the Soviet side. "There was no pressure," the chancellor said.

USSR-FRG Relations Analyzed

LD051257 Moscow TASS in English 1145 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

The Soviet-West German talks are in the spotlight of attention of the international public and press. And this is natural for the most important problems of war and peace are now being discussed in Moscow. It will not be an overstatement to say that the world's tomorrow depends on their solution.

The Moscow-Bonn talks are held at a time when the international situation has aggravated seriously. Particular concern is caused by the fact that the adherents of power politics are preparing to turn Europe into an area of the utmost military and political tension. The problem of ensuring European security assumes particular acuteness in connection with the plans of deploying new U.S. medium-range nuclear weapons in Western Europe, above all on the FRG territory. It is not surprising that in Europe and beyond its limits people are asking why there is no progress at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva where the question of nuclear arms limitation in Europe is being discussed. This question is evermore legitimate since the whole world knows of the steps taken by the Soviet side, the steps aimed at achieving agreement.

Voices at times sound in the West saying that the Geneva talks are not so successful. Well, some have a right to be of such an opinion on the state of affairs in Geneva, but this does not change the essence of the matter. And the essence is that if any result has been achieved in Geneva, it is only one result: The talks underway there showed that Washington which is striving at any cost to disrupt the approximate parity of forces that has formed in Europe and the world, has no wish for any advance, is stubbornly sabotaging the talks, is carrying them into a planned impasse. The talks showed that Washington and NATO have been staking and continue to stake not at the lowering of the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe but, quite the contrary, at raising that level, that "Reagan's team" assumed and continues the most dangerous course at turning a number of West European countries, above all the FRG, into the Pentagon's nuclear hostage. Already now "the Reagan's team" views Europe as a potential theatre of operations at which the Washington strategists would like to try out their cannibalistic concepts of "limited", "preemptive", and other nuclear wars.

Is there still a possibility to direct developments into a different course? There still is, and the USSR is calling over and over again for this possibility to be used. Our country stands for complete equality between the two military-political groupings in Europe in missiles, planes and warheads and at the lowest possible level. The concrete, constructive and far-reaching proposals of the Soviet Union on this score are well known. Now Washington and NATO should cast aside their dangerous policy of confrontation, weigh up soberly and objectively the alarming tendencies of present-day international relations, draw sensible conclusions and use the same yardstick to measure the security of the Soviet Union and its allies as they use to measure their own.

They often say in Bonn how important it is to learn the lessons of history. It indeed is, but these lessons show that while the attempts to do business with the USSR "from positions of strength" always failed in the past, this adventuristic course is all the more hopeless today. Those Western forces which blindly follow their Washington guide should be fully aware that if a threat of war is posed to the Soviet people from Western Europe, first and foremost from West Germany territory, again, for the first time in postwar history, our country will respond to it not with concessions at the Geneva talks, as sometimes certain figures in the West claim.

We and our allies will respond by taking prompt additional measures to strengthen our security and develop a counterbalance to NATO's new military potential. As a result the balance will be restored but at a higher level and the threat to European security, not the least to West German security, will grow dramatically rather than decrease. Responsibility for this will fall upon the authors and executors of NATO's present-day plans.

One cannot agree more with Chancellor Helmut Kohl when he says that peace in Europe and all over the world can only be strengthened by joint efforts. We can only add that it is not enough to announce this truth. It is necessary to back it with practical deeds for a lasting peace to become reality.

Arms Stance Criticized

LD052051 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Jul 83

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Viktor Levin]

[Text] On 5 July Soviet-West German talks were completed in Moscow.

During the meeting with Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Helmut Kohl, federal chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, a great deal of attention was devoted to problems of European security.

Comrade Andropov stressed that the question of preventing a new nuclear arms race in Europe, which is fraught with unpredictable consequences, is assuming particular importance. This refers to the attempt by the NATO bloc to drastically change the strategic situation in Europe to the detriment of the vital interests of the USSR and its allies. It is planned to turn FRG territory into a launching pad for American first-strike nuclear missiles aimed at the Soviet Union and its allies.

Essentially this would mean the revival of the threat of a war against the Soviet Union being unleashed from German soil.

Comrade Andropov dwelt in detail on the Soviet Union's position at the Geneva talks with the United States on the question of nuclear weapons in Europe. Our country entered these talks with the sincere desire to achieve positive results.

It is known that the Soviet Union has repeatedly taken important initiatives which opened a real path toward achieving an accord. In doing so, the Soviet Union set the task of sharply reducing the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe with the strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security. By the way, at the present meeting in Moscow the leaders of the socialist states also reemphasized that it is possible to achieve a mutually acceptable agreement if the interests of both sides are taken into account. Our country is taking them into account, but the United States is essentially demanding the unilateral disarmament of the Soviet Union with the preservation intact of the medium-range nuclear arms which the NATO countries have at their disposal. Thus the United States is stubbornly trying to talk only about missiles, disregarding the fact that it has some 700 aircraft, delivery vehicles of medium-range nuclear weapons, at its disposal in Europe. Moreover, the United States is insisting that the Soviet Union should not take into account the considerable quantity of medium-range nuclear weapons possessed by Britain and France, although these weapons are aimed at the Soviet Union and its allies. These are attempts by the United States to achieve military superiority. But these are vain hopes. They are just as unfounded as the claims being circulated in NATO countries that the Soviet Union will make concessions in Geneva after the new American missiles have been brought to West Europe. This, Comrade Andropov stressed during the conversation with the FRG chancellor, is a profound and dangerous delusion.

Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov set out the position of the Soviet Union frankly and precisely. He said outright that our country finds it hard to understand what the FRG hopes to gain from the deployment on its territory of American nuclear missiles, from our measures in response and from the oversaturation of the center of Europe with all kinds of weapons of mass destruction.

If the American missiles are deployed on West German territory, the military threat for the FRG will increase many times. Certain complications in relations between our two countries are also bound to occur. The Soviet Union would prefer events to take another course. Our country sees a way to mutual understanding in complete frankness combined with goodwill and a readiness to cooperate for the sake of peace and goodneighborliness.

As is noted in the TASS telegram, Chancellor Kohl highly appreciated the frank nature of the conversation, but at the same time he set out the well-known position of the leading circles of the NATO bloc on the question of the deployment of new American nuclear missiles on the territory of a number of West European countries, and in the first place in the FRG.

In this connection I would like to recall also the following circumstance: according to data of public opinion polls, considerably more than half of the FRG's citizens are coming out against the deployment of new American nuclear missiles. The congress of natural scientists from the FRG, the United States, Britain, Italy, the Netherlands and Sweden, which took place in the West German town of Mainz, has met with a wide response. At this congress, a document was adopted which is entitled "Appeal from Mainz." In it the scientists called on the FRG Government not to permit the siting of American medium-range nuclear weapons. The scientists came to the conclusion that the Pershing-II missiles are a first-strike weapon and can destabilize the balance of forces. Thus it is only possible to talk of a mandate by the electorate for the deployment of American missiles provided one ignores the facts.

BUSH CONTINUES W. EUROPE TOUR TO DENMARK, ICELAND

Meets Danish Premier

LD051644 Moscow in Finnish to Finland 1530 GMT 4 Jul 83

[Text] U.S. Vice President Bush, who is on a tour of West Europe, noted at his talks in Copenhagen with Prime Minister Poul Schluter that there might be progress at the Geneva missile talks before the end of the summer. George Bush is trying to make the Danes believe that results will be achieved at the Geneva talks within the next few days. In reality the administration is not trying to achieve agreement there.

Speaking about flexibility, the United States maintains its previous stance. But we know that the implementation of the zero option or its interim solution version would give the United States an undeniable strategic superiority. Such an attitude is advantageous to the United States. On the one hand an apparent impression of talks is created, and on the other, it does not prevent a cold-blooded and determined preparation for nuclear war, for the deployment of first-strike weapons in Europe.

While we note that Bush is whipping up among the Danes a false idea that an agreement is already close in Geneva, we have used as a starting-point the principled Soviet stance on missiles question. It has been explained very clearly. In the balance of European forces the British and French nuclear weapons must also be taken into account. The Soviet Union will not embark the path of unilateral disarmament. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbook, also has noted that such a line is just and well-considered.

The feeling that agreement is close is erroneous also because the proposal by Parliament [Moscow in Swedish to Sweden at 1800 GMT 4 Jul says "Danish Parliament" in a similar report] to continue talks next year and to halt the preparations for the deployment of the weapons is regarded in the United States as the height of political short-sightedness. This is stated at least by Eugene Rostow.

From this we see that the United States does not favor a sensible attitude, but automatic action by NATO. Bush's claims that agreement at the Geneva talks is within sight shows in itself the dishonest U.S. attitude toward the Geneva talks and also its dishonest attitude toward those whom it vaunts as its allies.

Bush Statements Attacked

LD052005 Moscow TASS in English 1830 GMT 5 Jul 83

["Bush vs Reagan? No, the Two vs Peace in Europe" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS -- News analyst Vladimir Goncharov writes:

Speaking in Copenhagen, the capital of Denmark, Monday, U.S. Vice-president George Bush made a sensational statement -- he described as a downright lie the assertions that the United States intended to fight "a limited nuclear war" in Europe.

U.S. and Western European radio and television companies picked up the vice-president's statement and fanned it out across the world. And today the statement is reproduced by U.S. and Western European papers. In other words, a propaganda campaign has been launched, the purpose of which is to prove that the United States has nothing to do at all with the plans of a "limited nuclear war," and that all this is from the evil one, or, according to George Bush, is a downright lie.

But if, after all, we approach the matter seriously? Does the U.S. vice-president really think that the international public cannot remember a thing, and that it has clean forgot that the concept of "a limited nuclear war" has been invented in Washington? Can the vice-President really believe that no one remembers how in the summer of 1980 the then president of the United States Jimmy Carter made a statement from which the world learnt for the first time about "Directive No 59" which announce precisely the doctrine of a "limited nuclear war"?

Let us assume that the Republican vice-president is simply inclined to disregard a statement made by a Democratic President, to dissociate himself from it. But what about a notorious statement made by the Republican President Ronald Reagan at the U.S. National Press Club November 18, 1981 -- the statement in which he blabbed out Washington's plans concerning a limited nuclear exchange in Europe?

A tide of protests in European countries at that time was so intense that U.S. propaganda topsiders began to deny the existence of any such plans. (This is what George Bush tried to do in Copenhagen, actually dissociating himself from Reagan's statement). Let us note, however, that despite the efforts of paid propaganda experts, U.S. Army General William Rogers, supreme allied commander, Europe, with the kind of straightforwardness befitting a soldier, put everything in its proper places. Asked by a French Catholic weekly Pelerin: "Don't you think that President Reagan's statement concerning the possibility of a limited nuclear war in Europe was a mistake"? General Rogers replied: "If you ask me wasn't it a mistake what the President said, I will tell you: 'no'!"

There is ample evidence that the Washington administration and the U.S. military continue to stake heavily on a "limited nuclear war."

The important thing is not who said what. The important thing is what the Washington administration headed by Reagan is doing. And it is doing everything to deploy new U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, to use them precisely in Europe, confining such operations exclusively to Europe, thus taking U.S. territory from within the framework of a potential nuclear conflict.

Denmark is known to be one of the Western European countries whose citizens are particularly active in a campaign of protest against Washington's adventurist plans. This is evidently why George Bush chose Copenhagen for his demagogical "denials." However, the Danes who know a thing or two about fairy tales, will hardly fall for George Bush's words and will be able to make out what is a lie, what is fiction, and what is reality.

Arrives in Iceland

LD060934 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 6 Jul 83

[Text] U.S. Vice President Bush has arrived in Iceland, the last stop of his tour around West European countries. This trip was undertaken in order to exert pressure on U.S. NATO allies, forcing them to agree to the deployment of U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles, regardless of the outcome of the Geneva talks on nuclear weapons in Europe. Bush's trip around West European countries is being accompanied by a wave of protests against Washington's militarist course.

ZIMYANIN-LED DELEGATION DEPARTS PARIS FOR MOSCOW

PM041415 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 July First Edition p 4

[TASS report]

[Text] The delegation of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet, led by Mikhail Zimyanin, deputy chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, left here for Moscow today. The delegation has been in France at the invitation of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the National Assembly of France.

At Paris Airport of Roissy the delegation was seen off by Claude Estier, deputy chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the National Assembly of France, chairman of the Franco-Soviet group of the National Assembly, and by other officials. Among the send-off party was Yu.M. Vorontsov, the USSR ambassador to France.

The delegation was met in Moscow by N.I. Ryzhkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other officials.

PRAVDA'S DEMCHENKO ON SHULTZ NEAR EAST VISIT

PM051025 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jul 83 First Edition p 5

[Article by Pavel Demchenko in "Commentator's Column": "To the Assistance of the Aggressor"]

[Text] For the second time within a comparatively short space of time U.S. Secretary of State Shultz has set off for the Near East. Although the precise program of his talks has not been published, the U.S. press reports that he will visit Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Israel, and afterward, perhaps, Syria, too, in order to "renew efforts aimed at the withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon." Within the concept of "foreign troops" Washington includes Israeli and Syrian units which are on Lebanese territory and also PLO detachments. All these forces, moreover, are placed on one level, although the Israelis burst into this country as aggressors while the Syrians were invited by the Lebanese Government.

Nevertheless, Israel, with Washington's blessing, has made the withdrawal of its troops conditional upon the prior departure of the Syrian units and the Palestinian detachments. Damascus rejects this way of putting it, believing that the occupiers must depart without any conditions and that Syria and Lebanon will solve their problems afterward by mutual agreement.

Thus an impasse has arisen in the fulfillment of the Lebanese-Israeli agreement. It has recently become clear that the continuation of the Israeli occupation is costing the aggressors a considerable amount. Nearly every day the patriots attack patrols and posts. The number of officers and men killed and wounded in the Israeli Army [em-] even following the "official" ending of hostilities [em-] is reckoned in many hundreds. The provocation of clashes with Syrian units in the Al-Biq'a' valley is not cheap, either.

Disturbed by this, the Israeli public has begun a campaign against the Begin government. In this situation, Washington has sent its emissary to the Near East in a hurry, so as to come to the assistance, for the umpteenth time, of its "strategic ally." The diplomacy of the United States would like to try to remove the main obstacle in the way of a settlement of the Near East question according to the U.S.-Israeli yardstick and with the aid of promises remove Syrian opposition to the aggressor. It is precisely from this standpoint that one should view the recent statement by the State Department representative that in the event of the departure of the Syrian troops from Lebanon, "it would be possible" to discuss the question of the Golan Heights, territory that was seized by Israel 16 years ago. They count on involving Saudi Arabia as an instrument of pressure on the Syrians.

Of course, it is a question not just and indeed not so much about assistance to an ally, but about something more. The Pentagon's plans, according to the NBC television company, include an increase in the strength of the contingent of Marines within the "multinational" forces in Lebanon. Washington therefore is making a fuss not about the departure of all "foreign troops" from Lebanon, certainly not. It does not include its own troops in this category but tries to dig in even more deeply on the soil of the Near East for U.S. imperialism seeks not peace in the region but the strengthening of its own military-strategic positions.

PLO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETS; ISSUES STATEMENT

LD011623 Moscow TASS in English 1122 GMT 1 Jul 83

[Text] Tunis July 1 TASS -- A session of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization chaired by Yasir 'Arafat has been held in the Tunisian capital. Its participants discussed the situation in the Middle East, as well as the situation formed in the Palestinian resistance movement, the Palestinian news agency WAFA reports.

A statement of the PLO Executive Committee circulated today, urges all the detachments of the Palestinian revolution to put an end to differences and to respect the principle of democratic dialogue in the solution of emerging problems. The PLO Executive Committee adopted a decision to set up a special committee from among its members, headed by the chairman of the National Council of Palestine al-Fahum, for settling differences in the Fatah movement and preserving its unity.

The PLO Executive Committee called on all Palestinian patriots to work for the unity of the Palestinian resistance movement and to oppose the capitulatory variants of the solution of the Middle East problem, and sent a message of greeting to the national patriotic forces of Lebanon fighting against the Israeli occupation.

PLO GROUPS MEET IN DAMASCUS, URGE UNITY

LD050043 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 Jul 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] A joint meeting of the Politburo of the People's Front for the Liberation of Palestine, the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, and the Palestinian Liberation Front has taken place in Damascus.

Having examined the situation in the Near East, the participants in the meeting stressed that the present tension in the region is a direct consequence of the aggressive course of U.S. imperialism and Israel. A statement was adopted in which it is pointed out that only the unity of all detachments of the Palestinian revolution can guarantee a successful struggle to restore the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

ARAB LEADERS TO MEET; SEEK TO HEAL PLO RIFT

PM051347 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 Jul 83 p 9

[Igor Belyayev commentary under the rubric "Viewpoint": "Crisis in Fatah -- to Whose Advantage?"]

[Text] In the last few weeks, the world press has been filled with reports about a crisis in Fatah, one of the Palestinian organizations. The U.S. mass news media in particular, and in many cases at the prompting of U.S. and Israeli special services, have stressed that this crisis is spearheaded against PLO Executive Committee Chairman 'Arafat. They also link the internal Palestinian crisis with Palestinian-Syrian relations. What actually happened within Fatah?

Abu Salih, one of the heads of the "rebel" group, stressed in one of his statements that differing attitudes toward the "Reagan plan" for a Near East settlement are among the reasons for the divergence of opinions.

A speech by the U.S. President to editors of U.S. Zionist newspapers was publicized almost simultaneously with the emergence of signs of divergence of opinions within Fatah. In his speech, Reagan emphasized that from now on he does not consider the establishment of Israeli settlements on occupied Arab territories as an obstacle to the attainment of peace in the Near East. Thus the U.S. President not only supported Israel but also strengthened the positions of both Begin and the government he heads. This latter, as is well known, has firmly rejected Reagan's "peace initiative." Now it has been simply buried. Of course, Reagan needs help from the Zionist lobby because of the forthcoming U.S. presidential election campaign for the November 1984 elections.

But the U.S. President's remarks about the Israeli settlements have brought rapture to Begin and his entourage. As a result, there are now no reasons at all to fear that someone from among the Palestinian leaders will accept the "Reagan Plan." After all, the U.S. President has practically given Israel the "green light" for the creeping annexation of the West Bank of Jordan and the Gaza Strip. Thus, he has yet again emphasized the anti-Palestinian and anti-Arab nature of U.S. policy in the Near East.

Under these conditions, the political and other clashes within the PLO emerge as events which are beneficial only to Israel and the United States. In this connection, the following events are worthy of attention.

The PLO Executive Committee gathered in Tunis to discuss the situation that has been created and decided to take urgent measures to prevent a split within the organization. An undoubtedly positive aspect of that meeting was the respect for the principle of democratic dialogue in the solution of all problems. It seems that an important step forward has been taken along the road of overcoming the differences of opinion.

'Arafat, King Fahd of Saudi Arabia, and Syrian President al-Assad will meet, possibly in Mecca or At-Ta'if, to block a further exacerbation of the situation within the Palestinian resistance movement. It is completely obvious that the three Arab leaders can do much for the normalization of the situation.

The U.S. mass news media continue to present matters as if it is not just Fatah but the entire PLO that is going through an almost irreversible political crisis unprecedented in its history. This line is the results of the special U.S. interest in exploiting the Arabs' weakness. Unmasking the U.S. intentions, the Moroccan newspapers L'OPINION wrote: "The United States and the Western countries are to blame for the situation that has developed. By taking advantage of this development (in other words the increased tension around the PLO -- I.B.) they want to implement a retrenching of forces in the region to their advantage."

Nevertheless, even if the U.S., West European, and Israeli press are making much noise about the split within the Palestinian resistance movement, the Palestinians themselves and sober-minded Arab politicians are calling for concentrated efforts to unite the ranks of all who oppose the Israeli aggression.

AL-KASM REJECTS ATTEMPTS TO PRESSURE SYRIA

LD042342 Moscow TASS in English 1748 GMT 4 Jul 83

[Text] Damascus July 4 TASS -- A meeting of the Council of Ministers of Syria was held here to discuss the situation in the Middle East. The meeting was chaired by Syria's Prime Minister 'Abd ar-Ra'uf al-Kasm.

Addressing the meeting, the prime minister emphasized that Syria's position remained firm and unchanged as regards the support of the Arab people of Palestine and the unity of all the groups of the Palestinian revolution. He said such unity was essential for the attainment by the Palestinian people of their legitimate national rights and for the thwarting of the plans of imperialism and Zionism aimed at preserving the Lebanese occupation, and dividing the Arabs.

'Abd ar-Ra'uf al-Kasm noted that attempts to make Syria change its position were doomed to failure. He stressed that Syria would continue to reject resolutely any pressure against it on the part of its enemies, their blackmail and threats to resort to aggression.

IZVESTIYA DISCUSSES ARAB, PLO UNITY, NEAR EAST

PM012008 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by V. Midtsev: "Trojan Horse and Arab Unity"]

[Text] Events in the Near East have confirmed that the imperialist circles' subversive actions against the Arab countries and the PLO have become multitargeted and permanent.

The "peace agreement" dictated to Lebanon and signed under Israeli and U.S. pressure, harks back to the past. Everything now taking place in that region is a far from fortuitous phenomenon. Official Washington's attitude toward the key problem of the Near East -- recognition of the Palestinians' rights, including the right to create their own state under the leadership of their sole legitimate representative, the PLO -- has always been distinguished by extreme hostility.

The 1978 Camp David deal prepared occupation reservations for the Palestinians and presupposed introducing dissent in the Arab countries' ranks. Relying on the betrayal of former Egyptian President as-Sadat and with the aid of the hypocritical "small steps policy" in which blackmail went hand in hand with overt bribery, Washington and Tel Aviv struck against the Palestinians and the Arab countries were offered an ignominious capitulation to imperialism's armed brigandage. The "peace treaty" between Israel and Egypt under U.S. supervision failed to bring tranquillity to the Near East. It paved the way to new aggression. Against Lebanon this time.

The Reagan administration toughened U.S. Near East policy still further, embarking on the path of inciting military conflicts. All the U.S. President's speeches since 1980 have rejected categorically and crudely the very fact of the existence of the PLO, which is recognized by the majority of the world community. But that was just one aspect. The other came down to physical reprisal, against the Palestinians and the hope of sowing defeatist sentiments among the Arab countries and foisting on them U.S. military patronage, which no one had requested.

The Israeli-Lebanese "agreement," also compiled to Washington's dictation, encroaches on Lebanon's security and dooms it to internal strife and the constant military presence of U.S. troops accompanied by the soldiers of the U.S. NATO allies. Having infiltrated someone else's home with the aid of the Israeli aggressors, the interventionists are raising a din and seeking culprits among the Palestinians, the PLO, and Lebanon's neighbors, primarily Syria, accusing them of not wanting "to promote peace." One might ask: What peace? "Peace" under the barrels of guns and tanks. A monstrous obfuscation natural to colonialists.

However hypocritical Washington and Tel Aviv may wax, they will never succeed in destroying the Palestinian people or depriving them of their homeland. There are no such rights. Obscurantism and genocide against the Palestinians are causing mounting protest among all honest people of the world. They understand very well that any act of aggression against the Palestinians will have grave consequences for the other Near East countries.

That is why the "agreement" between Israel and Lebanon have failed to meet with approval from the Arab countries, except for Egypt, Sudan, and Oman. They realize that it is no accident that Israel has been declared a "U.S. strategic ally." The aggressor is billed by Washington as "a partner for peace negotiations" with the other Arab countries, without any commitments being given regarding the renunciation of threats and force.

U.S. official circles seem to be telling the Arabs: "Accept Israel's conditions or we cannot guarantee the nonuse of force against you." They want to draw the Arabs into talks with the aggressor and are seeking to split the Arab countries so that, in isolation, they will cave in to Tel Aviv's territorial and political claims.

Washington is hoping that the so-called "moderate" countries will betray the pan-Arab cause. It is rushing to pull the wool over people's eyes, hinting that Saudi Arabia and Jordan have been sympathetic to the Lebanese-Israeli "agreement" and are on the point of joining the Camp David side. U.S. Secretary of State Shultz has allegedly already received assurances from them that they will bring pressure to bear on Syria to get it to withdraw its troops from Lebanon. The business of those for whom misinformation serves as virtually their main weapon is an unenviable one.

It is well known that neither Jordan nor Saudi Arabia have approved the agreement signed by Lebanon under U.S. pressure. They have not opposed Syria's intention to withdraw its troops from Lebanon after the Israeli occupiers leave that country. Nor have they turned away from the PLO. On what grounds, may we ask, do the U.S. officials and media claim that the "moderates" will betray the pan-Arab course and abandon Syria and the Palestinians in the face of the dangerous intrigues of the joint forces of imperialism and Zionism?

Riyadh and Amman can scarcely fail to understand that these intrigues are aimed against all Arab countries without exception. The implementation of the U.S. and Israeli plans entails a real threat of a further widening of Israeli expansion in the Near East and of new aggression against other Arab countries.

Israel and its transatlantic patrons also need to undermine pan-Arab unity in order to isolate the PLO politically, to demolish that organization by exploiting the differences which have been exacerbated in its ranks, and then to eliminate the Palestinian problem altogether. Only by acting jointly, and cohesively, can the Arabs thwart these designs. Only by acting in a unified front can the Arab states topple the U.S. militarist plans to turn the Near East region into a U.S. military-strategic bridgehead and thwart Washington's hegemonist plans to foist U.S. political, military, and economic domination on the countries of this region.

The question of the unity of the Arab world is thus now becoming the number one problem, directly linked with the security of each Arab state and the entire region as a whole. The development of events in the Near East attests that the Palestinians will never permit the imperialist and Zionist circles to deprive them of their motherland. Only the collective efforts of all sides involved, including the PLO, can bring peace and tranquillity to the Near East countries.

Arab unity was born and has asserted its viability under conditions of courageous opposition to the expansionist aspirations of Israel and the United States. Today it is more necessary than ever.

USSR-IRAQI ECONOMIC PROTOCOL PROMOTES COOPERATION

PM041506 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Developing Cooperation"]

[Text] A routine session of the Soviet-Iraqi Standing Commission for Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation was held in Moscow 28-30 June. Questions on realizing the existing agreements on cooperation in construction and running a number of projects and developing trade between the USSR and Iraq were discussed.

III. 6 Jul 83

H 6

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

The prospects for economic relations between the two countries were examined, including in the spheres of power generation, the oil industry, agriculture, irrigation, and water resources construction, and the training of Iraqi national cadres. It was pointed out that the session will promote the further broadening of equitable and mutually advantageous Soviet-Iraqi economic cooperation in the spirit of the friendship and cooperation treaty between the USSR and the Republic of Iraq.

The session protocol was signed by Ya.P. Ryabov, chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, and Subhi Yasin Khudayr Iraqi minister of industry and minerals. A protocol on commodity turnover between the USSR and the Republic of Iraq for 1983 was signed at the same time.

EFFORTS OF MAGHREB COUNTRIES TOWARD UNITY CITED

LD051054 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 4 Jul 83

[Vladimir Bilyakov commentary from the "Window on the Arab World" program]

[Text] The visit of Colonel Mu'ammr al-Qadhdhafi, leader of the revolution, to Morocco has ended after his talks with King Hassan II. In connection with this visit, news agencies said that this was the first visit paid by Mu'ammr al-Qadhdhafi to Morocco. The two sides discussed urgent Arab issues and agreed to expand economic, trade and cultural cooperation.

The visit by Col Mu'ammr al-Qadhdhafi to Morocco is one of several visits at the summit level by leaders of the Arab Maghreb in recent months. These visits indicate the desire of these countries to normalize relations between them and coordinate positions on major international issues. This desire reflects the growing trend toward unity among the peoples of the Arab Maghreb. Such a trend is a natural answer to the imperialist plots which fan the flames of local conflicts and seek to sow the seeds of discord between the Arab Maghreb countries in order to be able to infiltrate into this region.

U.S. 'PROVOCATION' IN LIBYAN AIRSPACE CITED

LD011409 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 1 Jul 83

[Text] The United States has carried out yet another provocative act against Libya. F-14 fighters based on the aircraft-carrier Eisenhower intercepted two Libyan military aircraft, which were on a patrol flight, in their country's airspace in the region of the Gulf of Sidra. The Libyan airmen did not give way to the Americans' provocation and returned to their base. Afterward U.S. aircraft made a raid deep into Libya's airspace.

PROMINENT CUBAN COMMUNIST PARTY OFFICIAL DIES

CPSU Condolence Message

PM041358 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jul 83 First Edition pl

[Text] To the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee:

The CPSU Central Committee expresses deep condolences to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba [PCC] on the untimely death of Arnaldo Milian Castro, a prominent figure of the Cuban Party, member of the Politburo of the PCC, member of the Council of State, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, and minister of agriculture of the Republic of Cuba.

Please convey our sincere sympathy to the relatives and friends of the deceased.

The CPSU Central Committee

Gorbachev Offers Condolences

LD051307 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] Today Comrade Gorbachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Comrade Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; and Comrade Mesyats, USSR Agriculture minister, visited the embassy of the Republic of Cuba in Moscow to sign the condolence book in connection with the untimely death of Arnaldo Milian Castro, an eminent figure in the Communist Party of Cuba, member of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee Politburo, member of the State Council, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, and minister of agriculture of the Republic of Cuba.

COLOMBIAN PARLIAMENTARIANS CONTINUE VISIT

Meet Kuznetsov

PM041433 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS Report: "Talk in the Kremlin"]

[Text] Moscow 1 Jul -- Vasiliy Kuznetsov, alternate member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and first vice president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has received at the Kremlin today a delegation of the National Congress of the Republic of Colombia led by Bernardo Guerra Serna, president of the National Congress.

We view the visit of the Colombian parliamentarians, Vasiliy Kuznetsov said, as a substantial step in the development of cooperation and mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and Colombia. The promotion of bilateral relations, based on the principles of equality and mutual benefit, meets the interests of both countries and the cause of international security, and there are still untapped reserves here. Vasiliy Kuznetsov told the guests about the Soviet people's achievements in building communism and described the latest Soviet peace initiatives aimed at curbing the arms race and averting the threat of nuclear war.

The leader of the delegation thanked the USSR Supreme Soviet for the invitation to visit the Soviet Union and for the hospitality accorded to the delegation. We are very pleased with our tour of the country, he said, which has enabled delegation members to learn about the life of the Soviet people and their remarkable achievements in developing their state. We know that the USSR vigorously advocates disarmament and is opposed to war. Meetings and conversations with Soviet people have been fresh proof of their ardent desire for peace, the visitor said. The Colombian people share the peace aspirations of the USSR and stand for promoting world peace and extending international cooperation.

Participating in the talk were A.P. Shitikov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union; T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; L.Ya. Florentyev, Colombia; other officials; and E. Lopez Gomez, Colombian ambassador to the USSR.

On 2 July the Colombian parliamentarians visited the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and laid a wreath. A wreath was also laid at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin Wall. On the same day the guests traveled to the Zavety Iliche Kolkhoz in the Moscow region.

Conclude Visit

PM051423 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Departure from Moscow"]

[Text] The Colombian National Congress delegation headed by its president, B. Guerra Serna, left Moscow 3 July. It had been in the USSR on an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

At the airport the guests were seen off by A.P. Shitikov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union; USSR Supreme Soviet deputies L.A. Makarova and L.Ya. Florentyev; V.G. Vysotin, chief of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium International Relations Department; L.M. Romanov, USSR ambassador to Colombia; other officials; and E. Lopez Gomez, Colombian ambassador to the USSR.

Before leaving, the delegation visited the USSR Exhibition of National Economic Achievements.

HONDURAN 'PROVOCATION' COULD UNLEASH WAR

LD021030 Moscow TASS in English 1011 GMT 2 Jul 83

[Text] Managua July 2 TASS -- Honduran artillery on Friday shelled several populated localities in the Nicaraguan department of Neuva Segovia.

The provocative actions of the Honduran military, the Nicaraguan Foreign Ministry said in a statement, are part of an aggressive plan which was drawn up by the enemies of the Sandinist revolution hoping to unleash an open war against Nicaragua.

This plan, Nicaraguan Internal Affairs Minister Tomas Borge, who is a member of the national leadership of the Sandinist National Liberation Front, told journalists here, is being carried out under the guidance of the U.S. C.I.A. which held a conference in Tegucigalpa recently with the Honduran command and leaders of counterrevolutionary groups. The conference, he said, discussed opportunities for using aircraft to bomb civilian and military targets in Nicaragua.

III. 6 Jul 83

K 3

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

A pretext for staging the projected armed action is to be served by an attack of a Somozist gang, dressed in Sandinist Army uniforms, on a settlement in Honduras. The Honduran military are planning to use the provocation to declare war on Nicaragua and make a thrust into its northern and southern as well as coastal areas. According to U.S. plans, Tomas Borge said, the act of aggression should be a lightning attack aimed to seize a considerable part of Nicaraguan territory.

The same conference, the Sandinist leader added, adopted a decision to enlist in the operation also the Chilean fascist regime which is to give naval support to the intrusion force.

SELSKAYA ZHIZN ON GUATEMALA SOLIDARITY DAY

PM041354 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 26 Jun 83 p 3

[Oleg Kolesnikov "Commentator's Opinion": "Patriots Struggle"]

[Text] Tomorrow is the International Day of Solidarity with the people of Guatemala. It is being held at the decision of the WPC, which has called on the peoples of the whole planet to strengthen support for the Guatemalans' heroic struggle for freedom and against oppression and terror.

Since the June 1954 coup organized by the U.S. CIA, as a result of which the progressive government of President J. Arbenz was overthrown, Guatemala has been governed by a succession of military dictatorial regimes. The present dictator, General Rios Montt, seized power in March last year. His rule has been marked by particular brutality and bloody repressions against the people. According to the press, over 12,000 people have been murdered and approximately 15,000 have disappeared without trace in the country during this American puppet's spell in power.

In a vain attempt to suppress the insurgent movement, the dictator has been carrying out massive punitive operations, the main victims of which have been the Indian peasants. The cutthroats from the fascist-type gangs and the military have been burning villages and shooting inhabitants, sparing neither old people, women, nor children.

Everything points to the fact that the Reagan administration plans to continue the tragedy of the Guatemalan people. The White House has elaborated a secret plan which envisages not simply a further increase in U.S. aid to the dictator Rios Montt, but also the dispatch to Guatemala of around 100 U.S. military "advisers."

But no repressions can stifle the Guatemalan people's struggle for freedom. The insurgents' detachments are being reinforced increasingly with new fighters who dream of seeing their motherland free. For the sake of this bright goal and the happiness of their people, they are fully determined to fight on to the complete victory.

BRIEFS

RSFSR DELEGATION VISITS VENEZUELA -- A delegation of leading workers of RSFSR soviets of people's deputies, led by Vinogradov, RSFSR minister of foreign affairs, has ended a visit to Venezuela which it made at the invitation of the Venezuelan Association for Municipal Cooperation. The guests from the USSR familiarized themselves with various spheres of the life of the Venezuelan people and the activity of the congress of the municipal committee of federal, regional, and local authority organs, and made a trip around the country. [Text] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 4 Jul 83 LD]

LATEST SATELLITE LAUNCHES, EXPERIMENTS REPORTED

Cosmonauts Unload Cosmos-1443

LDO11313 Moscow TASS in English 1223 GMT 1 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS - A TASS correspondent reports from the mission control centre: Vladimir Lyakhov and Aleksandr Aleksandrov have been working on board the "Salyut-7" -- "Soyuz T-9" -- "Cosmos-1443" orbital complex for the fourth day.

The cosmonauts are unloading the satellite spaceship "Cosmos-1443" and continue reactivating the station and preparing scientific instrumentation for the forthcoming research. They have loaded film into manual cameras and switched on the "Astra-1" mass-spectrometric apparatus. Today the crew opened the hatch and inspected the return module of the "Cosmos-1443" spaceship. The return module is designed to deliver back to earth research materials and various cargoes with an aggregate weight of up to 500 kilograms. The schedule of the day also envisages physical exercises and a television reportage. According to telemetric data and reports from orbit, the flight of the research complex "Salyut-7" -- "Soyuz T-9" -- "Cosmos-1443" is proceeding normally. The state of health of Vladimir Lyakhov and Aleksandr Aleksandrov is good and they are feeling well.

Cosmos-1472 Launched

LDO60635 Moscow TASS in English 0628 GMT 6 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 5, TASS -- A new artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-1472, was launched in the Soviet Union on July 5 to continue the study of the earth's natural resources in the interests of different branches of the national economy of the USSR and international cooperation. The initial period of revolution of the satellite is 88.8 minutes, maximum distance from the earth -- 264 kilometres, minimum distance -- 197 kilometres, the inclination of its orbit -- 82.4 degrees. The apparatus aboard the satellite is functioning normally.

Eight Satellites Launched

LDO61144 Moscow TASS in English 1132 GMT 6 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS -- The Soviet Union has put into orbit today eight artificial earth satellites of the Cosmos series with nos. 1473-1480. All the eight have been put into their orbits by one carrier rocket. The satellites carry scientific equipment to continue exploration of outer space. All the eight satellites follow orbits which are close to the calculated ones with the initial parameters: period revolution -- 115.1 minutes; maximum distance from earth's surface -- 1,511 km; minimum distance from earth's surface -- 1,448 km; inclination of the orbit -- 74 degrees. The equipment carried by the satellites is operating normally.

'Gorizont' Satellite

LDO11412 Moscow TASS in English 1410 GMT 1 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS -- Communication satellite "Gorizont", next in the series, has been launched in the Soviet Union today in accordance with the programme for a further development of the communication and telecasting systems with the use of artificial earth satellites. "Gorizont" (horizon) has been put into an orbit close to a stationary circular orbit with the following initial parameters: distance from the earth's surface -- 36,600 kilometres, period of revolution around the earth -- 24 hours 39 minutes, inclination of the orbit -- 1.3 degrees. The onboard equipment of the satellite "Gorizont" is functioning normally. The satellite is controlled from the command and measurement complex. The communication and television equipment of the satellite will operate in accordance with the pre-set programme.

USTINOV NOTES TASKS OF BALTIC EXERCISES

LD052107 Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] The Soviet Union has completed another exercise of its Armed Forces. Here is what our observer writes:

I would like to draw your attention to the word "another." In this case it's equivalent to "ordinary." You know, of course, that armies in all countries hold troop exercises. Soviet soldiers held theirs according to the plan of combat training adopted by the national Armed Forces. This time the exercises which were announced well in advance involved the units that are stationed in the western regions of the USSR -- namely, the Soviet republics in the Baltic area and the republic of Belorussia.

The aim of the exercises, according to the military terminology, was perfecting the coordination and cooperation of all military arms and services in carrying out joint combat actions. The exercises were supervised by the USSR Minister of Defense Marshal Dmitriy Ustinov. They involved aviation and artillery, tank and rocket units, landing troops, motorized infantry units and the combat ships of the Baltic Navy. At present the Soviet Armed Forces are a complex organism. All its parts must be firmly linked together, so to speak. The exercises showed that, indeed, there is a linkage of this kind. Soldiers displayed great mastership and a perfect ability to handle the powerful military equipment they have been receiving from the national industry.

Indeed, we have to use part of the national economic potential for the needs of the Army and Navy. We cannot help it because the international situation, unfortunately, is causing us Soviet people concern and even alarm. No wonder; the United States, for instance, has made frantic anti-Sovietism and anticommunism the backbone of its foreign policy. It was President Reagan who announced last year a so-called crusade against communism. Such an action naturally draws counteraction.

Here is what Marshal Ustinov had to say when he met with the soldiers of one of the units that took part in the exercises just over. The Soviet minister of defense said that the United States and its NATO allies had been stubbornly stepping up armed preparations in the hope to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Treaty countries and dictate to us how we should live and administer our affairs. Marshal Ustinov described the policy as extremely dangerous. The Soviet Union, he said, has put forward a number of important initiatives to stop the arms race and prevent a nuclear war, but these proposals had been virtually rejected by the Reagan administration. Naturally, the USSR and its allies will adopt all the necessary measures to ensure their security. Marshal Ustinov said that, in these conditions, the task is tirelessly building up the defenses of the nation and raising the combat readiness of its Armed Forces. In other words, the task is doing everything necessary so that the enemy will not take us by surprise. In any case and in any adventure, Marshal Ustinov added, the enemy should be given a fitting and crushing rebuff.

The military exercises just held in the western regions of the USSR show that the Soviet people and its Army are ready for such rebuff.